arXiv:1207.3746v2 [math.AP] 24 Jul 2012

Global Well-Posedness of Classical Solutions to the Cauchy Problem of Two-Dimensional Baratropic Compressible Navier-Stokes System with Vacuum and Large Initial Data *

Xiangdi HUANG[a], Jing LI[b]

[a] Academy of Mathematics and System Sciences,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, P. R. China

[b] Institute of Applied Mathematics, AMSS,
& Hua Loo-Keng Key Laboratory of Mathematics,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, P. R. China

Abstract

For smooth initial data, we establish the global existence and uniqueness of strong and classical solutions to the Cauchy problem for the barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations in two spatial dimensions with vacuum state as far field and with no restrictions on the size of initial data provided the shear viscosity is a positive constant and the bulk one is $\lambda = \rho^\beta$ with $\beta > 4/3$.

Keywords: compressible Navier-Stokes equations; Cauchy problem; global classical solutions; large initial data; vacuum states.

1 Introduction and main results

We are concerned with the two-dimensional barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations which read as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + \mathrm{div}(\rho u) = 0, \\ (\rho u)_t + \mathrm{div}(\rho u \otimes u) + \nabla P = \mu \triangle u + \nabla((\mu + \lambda)\mathrm{div} u), \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $t \geq 0, x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \rho = \rho(x,t)$ and $u = (u_1(x,t), u_2(x,t))$ represent the density and velocity respectively, and the pressure P is given by

$$P(\rho) = R\rho^\gamma, \quad \gamma > 1. \tag{1.2}$$

The shear viscosity μ and the bulk one λ satisfy the following hypothesis:

$$\mu = const, \quad \lambda(\rho) = b\rho^\beta, \ b > 0, \ \beta > 0. \tag{1.3}$$

---

*This research is partially supported by National Science Foundation of China under grant 10971215.
Email: xdhuang@amss.ac.cn (X. Huang), ajingli@gmail.com (J. Li).

In the sequel, we set $R = b = 1$ without loosing any generality. We consider the Cauchy problem with (ρ, u) vanishing at infinity. For given initial data ρ_0 and m_0, we require that

$$\rho(x,0) = \rho_0(x), \quad \rho u(x,0) = m_0(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{1.4}$$

There is a huge literature on the large time existence and behavior of solutions to (1.1) with constant viscosity coefficients. The one-dimensional problem has been studied extensively by many people, see [12, 19, 28, 29] and the references therein. For the multi-dimensional case, the local existence and uniqueness of classical solutions are known in [25, 30] in the absence of vacuum and recently, for strong solutions also, in [3, 4, 27] for the case that the initial density need not be positive and may vanish in open sets. More recently, for two-dimensional case, Li-Liang [21] obtain the existence and uniqueness of the local strong and classical solutions with vacuum as far field.

The global classical solutions were first obtained by Matsumura-Nishida [24] for initial data close to a non-vacuum equilibrium in some Sobolev space H^s. Later, Hoff [13] studied the problem for discontinuous initial data. For the existence of solutions for large data, the major breakthrough is due to Lions [23] (see also Feireisl [10, 11]), where he obtained global existence of weak solutions, defined as solutions with finite energy, when the exponent γ is suitably large. The main restriction on initial data is that the initial energy is finite, so that the density is allowed to vanish initially. Recently, Huang-Li-Xin [16] established the global existence and uniqueness of classical solutions to the Cauchy problem for the isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations in three-dimensional space with smooth initial data which are of small energy but possibly large oscillations; in particular, the initial density is allowed to vanish, even has compact support.

However, there are few results regarding global strong solvability for equations of multi-dimensional motions of viscous gas with no restrictions on the size of initial data. One of the first ever ones is due to Vaigant-Kazhikhov [32] who obtained a remarkable result which can be stated that the two-dimensional system (1.1)-(1.4) admits a unique global strong solution for large initial data away from vacuum provided $\beta > 3$ and the domain is bounded. Recently, under some additional compatibility conditions on the periodic initial data, Jiu-Wang-Xin [17] considered periodic classical solutions and removed the condition that the initial density should be away from vacuum in Vaigant-Kazhikhov [32] but still under the same condition $\beta > 3$ as that in [32]. More recently, for periodic initial data with initial density allowed to vanish, we [14] not only relax the crucial condition $\beta > 3$ of [32] to the one that $\beta > 4/3$, but also obtain both the time-independent upper bound of the density and the large-time behavior of the strong and weak solutions. It should be noted that both [32] and [14] only consider the periodic case or the case of bounded domains. Thus, the aim of this paper is to consider the Cauchy problem (1.1)-(1.4) in the whole space $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Before stating the main results, we explain the notations and conventions used throughout this paper. We denote

$$\int f dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f dx.$$

For $1 \le r \le \infty$, we also denote the standard Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces as follows:

$$L^r = L^r(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad W^{s,r} = W^{s,r}(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad H^s = W^{s,2}.$$

Thus, the first main result concerning the global existence of strong solutions can be stated as follows:

Theorem 1.1 *Assume that*

$$\beta > 4/3, \quad \gamma > 1, \tag{1.5}$$

and that the initial data $(0 \le \rho_0, m_0)$ *satisfy that for some* $q > 2$ *and* $a \in (1, 2)$

$$\bar{x}^a \rho_0 \in L^1 \cap H^1 \cap W^{1,q}, \quad \nabla u_0 \in L^2, \quad \rho_0^{1/2} u_0 \in L^2, \quad m_0 = \rho_0 u_0, \tag{1.6}$$

with

$$\bar{x} \triangleq (e + |x|^2)^{1/2} \log(e + |x|^2). \tag{1.7}$$

Then the problem (1.1)-(1.4) *has a unique global strong solution* (ρ, u) *satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \rho \in C([0, T]; L^1 \cap H^1 \cap W^{1,q}), \quad \bar{x}^a \rho \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1 \cap H^1 \cap W^{1,q}), \\ u \in L^\infty(0, T; H^1_{\rm loc}), \quad \nabla u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2) \cap L^{(q+1)/q}(0, T; W^{1,q}), \\ t^{1/2} \nabla u \in L^2(0, T; W^{1,q}), \quad t^{1/2} u_t \in L^2(0, T; H^1_{\rm loc}), \\ t^{1/2} \nabla(u_t + u \cdot \nabla u) \in L^2(0, T; L^2), \\ \sqrt{\rho} u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2), \quad \rho u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^1 \cap H^1), \\ \sqrt{\rho} u_t, \, (\rho u)_t \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, T)), \quad t^{1/2} \sqrt{\rho} u_t, \, t^{1/2} (\rho u)_t \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2), \end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

for any $0 < T < \infty$.

We also obtain the global existence of classical solutions provided the initial data (ρ_0, m_0) satisfies some additional regularity and compatibility conditions, that is, we have

Theorem 1.2 *In addition to* (1.5) *and* (1.6), *assume further that* (ρ_0, u_0) *satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \nabla^2 \rho_0, \, \nabla^2 \lambda(\rho_0), \, \nabla^2 P(\rho_0) \in L^2 \cap L^q, \quad \nabla^2 u_0 \in L^2, \\ \nabla^2(\bar{x}^{\delta_0} \rho_0), \, \nabla^2(\bar{x}^{\delta_0} \lambda(\rho_0)), \, \nabla^2(\bar{x}^{\delta_0} P(\rho_0)) \in L^2, \end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

for some constant $\delta_0 \in (0, 1)$, *and the following compatibility condition:*

$$- \mu \triangle u_0 - \nabla((\mu + \lambda(\rho_0)) {\rm div} u_0) + \nabla P(\rho_0) = \rho_0^{1/2} g, \tag{1.10}$$

with some $g \in L^2$, *the Cauchy problem* (1.1)-(1.4) *has a unique global classical solution* (ρ, u) *in* $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \infty)$ *satisfying that, in addition to* (1.8), *for any* $0 < T < \infty$,

$$\begin{cases} \nabla^2 \rho, \; \nabla^2 \lambda(\rho), \; \nabla^2 P(\rho) \in C([0, T]; L^2 \cap L^q), \\ \nabla^2(\bar{x}^{\delta_0} \rho), \; \nabla^2(\bar{x}^{\delta_0} \lambda(\rho)), \; \nabla^2(\bar{x}^{\delta_0} P(\rho)) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2), \\ \nabla^2 u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2), \quad t \nabla^3 u \in L^\infty(0, T; L^q), \\ t u_t \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2_{\rm loc}), \quad \nabla u_t \in L^2(0, T; L^2), \\ t \nabla^2 u_t \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2), \quad t \nabla u_{tt} \in L^2(0, T; L^2), \\ t \nabla^2(\rho u) \in L^\infty(0, T; L^{(q+2)/2}). \end{cases} \tag{1.11}$$

A few remarks are in order:

Remark 1.1 *First, it follows from (1.8) and (1.11) that, for any* $0 < \tau < T < \infty$,

$$(\rho, \; \nabla \rho) \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}^2} \times [0, T]), \tag{1.12}$$

and

$$\rho u \in H^1(0,T;L^2) \hookrightarrow C([0,T];L^2). \tag{1.13}$$

The Gargilardo-Nirenberg inequality shows

$$\|\nabla(\rho u)\|_{C(\overline{\mathbb{R}^2})} \le C\|\rho u\|_{L^2}^{(q-2)/(3q+2)} \|\nabla^2(\rho u)\|_{L^{(q+2)/2}}^{2(q+2)/(3q+2)},$$

which together with (1.13) *and* (1.11) *yields that*

$$\rho_t \in C(\overline{\mathbb{R}^2} \times [\tau,T]). \tag{1.14}$$

Next, we deduce from (1.8) and (1.11) that

$$\nabla u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1) \cap H^1(0,T;L^2) \cap L^\infty(\tau,T;W^{2,q}) \hookrightarrow C([\tau,T];C^1(\overline{\mathbb{R}^2})), \tag{1.15}$$

and that

$$\nabla u_t \in H^1(\tau,T;L^2) \hookrightarrow C([\tau,T];L^2), \tag{1.16}$$

which combining with $\nabla^2 u_t \in L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2)$ *gives that*

$$\nabla u_t \in C([\tau,T];L^p), \tag{1.17}$$

for any $p > 2$.

Finally, since $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^1_{\rm loc})$ *and* $u_t \in L^\infty(\tau,T;L^2_{\rm loc})$*, we get from* (1.15) *and* (1.17) *that for any* $R > 0$,

$$u,\, u_t \in C([\tau,T] \times \overline{B_R}),$$

which as well as (1.12) *and* (1.14)-(1.16) *thus shows that the solution* (ρ,u) *obtained in Theorem 1.2 is in fact a classical one to the Cauchy problem (1.1)-(1.4) in* $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,\infty)$.

Remark 1.2 *Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 generalize and improve the earlier results due to Vaigant-Kazhikhov [32] where they required that* $\beta > 3$ *and that the domain is bounded. Moreover, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 also extend the previous results due to Huang-Li [14] where they consider the periodic case to the Cauchy problem in the whole space* $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Remark 1.3 *It is worth noting here that Zhang-Fang [33, Theorem 1.8] showed that if* $(\rho,u) \in C^1([0,T];H^k), k > 3$ *is a spherically symmetric solution to the Cauchy problem* (1.1)-(1.4) *with the compact supported initial density* $\rho_0 \not\equiv 0$, T *must be finite provided* $1 < \beta \le \gamma$. *However, in Theorem 1.2, for* ρ, *we have* $\rho \in C([0,T];H^2)$, *but for* u, *only* $\nabla u \in H^k$. *Note that the function* $u \in \{\nabla u \in H^k\}$ *decays much slower for large values of the spatial variable* x *than the one* $u \in H^{k+1}$. *Therefore, it seems that it is the slow decay of the velocity field for large values of the spatial variable* x *that leads to the global existence of smooth solutions.*

Remark 1.4 *It should be mentioned here that it seems that* $\beta > 1$ *is the extremal case for the system* (1.1)-(1.3) *(see [32]). Therefore, it would be interesting to study the problem* (1.1)-(1.4) *when* $1 < \beta \le 4/3$. *This is left for the future.*

We now comment on the analysis of this paper. Note that for initial data satisfying the conditions of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, the local existence and uniqueness of strong and classical solutions to the Cauchy problem (1.1)-(1.4) have been established in [21]. Thus, to extend the strong and classical solutions globally in time, one needs global a priori estimates on smooth solutions to (1.1)-(1.4) in suitable higher norms. To do so, motivated by [14,15], it turns out that the key issue in this paper is to derive the upper bound for the density. We try to modify the analysis in [14,32]. However, the methods in [14, 32] can not be applied directly to our case since the arguments in [14, 32] rely heavily on the fact that the domain is bounded. In fact, for the whole space $\mathbb{R}^2$, it seems difficult to bound the L^p-norm of u just in terms of $\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}$. To overcome the difficulties caused by the unbounded domain, some new ideas are needed. The key observations of this paper are as follows: On the one hand, for system (1.1), it is enough to bound the L^p-norm of the momentum ρu instead of bounding the L^p-norm of the velocity u, and on the other hand, since ρ decays for large values of the spatial variable x, the momentum ρu decays faster than u itself. To this end, we first establish a key Hardy-type inequality with the explicit expression of $\|\rho u\|_{L^p}$ in terms of p (see (2.8) for details). Next, we obtain the spatial weighted mean estimate of the density(see (3.8)). Then, rewriting $(1.1)_2$ as (3.14) in terms of a sum of commutators of Riesz transforms and the operators of multiplication by u_i (see (3.13)) as in [14,22,26], we succeed in deriving the estimate of $L^\infty(0,T;L^p)$-norm of the density (see (3.10)) after using the spatial weighted mean estimate of the density we have just derived, the Hardy type inequality (see (2.3)), and the L^p-estimate of the commutators due to Coifman-Rochberg-Weiss [5](see (2.10)). Next, by energy type estimates and the compensated compactness analysis [7, Theorem II.1], we show that $\log(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2})$ does not exceed a polynomial function of $\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}$ (see (3.26)). Then, using the $W^{1,p}$-estimate of the commutator due to Coifman-Meyer [6] (see (2.11)) and the explicit expression of $\|\rho u\|_{L^r}$ in term of r (see (2.8)), we obtain an estimate on the $L^1(0,T;L^\infty)$-norm of the commutators in terms of L^∞-norm of the density (see (3.43)). Both estimates together with the Brezis-Wainger inequality (see (2.12)) lead to the key a priori estimate on $\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}$ provided $\beta > 4/3$. See Proposition 3.1 and its proof.

The next main step is to bound the gradients of the density. We first obtain the temporal weighted mean estimates on the material derivatives of the velocity which is achieved by modifying the basic estimates on the material derivatives of the velocity due to Hoff [13]. Then, following [15], the L^p-bound of the gradient of the density can be obtained by solving a logarithm Gronwall inequality based on a Beale-Kato-Majda type inequality (see Lemma 2.6), the a priori estimates we have just derived and some careful initial layer analysis; and moreover, such a derivation yields simultaneously also the bound for $L^1(0,T;L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))$-norm of the gradient of the velocity; see Proposition 4.2 and its proof.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we collect some elementary facts and inequalities which will be needed in later analysis. Section 3 is devoted to the derivation of upper bound on the density which is needed to extend the local solution to all time. Based on the previous estimates, higher-order ones are established in Sections 4 and 5. Then finally, the main results, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, are proved in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

The following local existence of strong and classical solutions can be found in [21].

Lemma 2.1 *Let $\beta \geq 1$ and $\gamma > 1$. Assume that (ρ_0, m_0) satisfies* (1.6). *Then there exist a small time $T > 0$ and a unique strong solution (ρ, u) to the problem* (1.1)-(1.4) *in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, T)$ satisfying* (1.8). *Moreover, if (ρ_0, u_0) satisfies* (1.9) *and* (1.10) *besides* (1.6), *(ρ, u) satisfies* (1.11) *also.*

The following Sobolev inequality will be used frequently.

Lemma 2.2 ([20, 31]) *There exists a universal positive constant C such that the following estimates hold for any $p \in (2, \infty)$,*

$$\|u\|_{L^p} \leq C p^{1/2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^{2p/(p+2)}}, \quad \|v\|_{L^p} \leq C p^{1/2} \|v\|_{L^2}^{2/p} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^{1-2/p}, \tag{2.1}$$

for any function $u \in \left\{ u \in L^p \,\middle|\, \nabla u \in L^{2p/(p+2)} \right\}$ and $v \in H^1$.

Lemma 2.2 directly yields

Lemma 2.3 *There exists a universal positive constant C such that for $\delta \in (0, 2]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 2]$, every function $v \in \left\{ v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \,\middle|\, |\nabla v| + |v \bar{x}^{-1}| \in L^2 \right\}$ satisfies*

$$\|v \bar{x}^{-\delta}\|_{L^{(2+\varepsilon)/\delta}} \leq C \delta^{-1/2} \left(\|\nabla v\|_{L^2} + \varepsilon^{-1} \|v \bar{x}^{-1}\|_{L^2} \right), \tag{2.2}$$

with $\bar{x}$ as in (1.7). *In particular, choosing $\varepsilon = 2$, we have*

$$\|v \bar{x}^{-\delta}\|_{L^{4/\delta}} \leq C \delta^{-1/2} \left(\|\nabla v\|_{L^2} + \|v \bar{x}^{-1}\|_{L^2} \right). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. Since

$$|\partial_i \bar{x}| \leq 3 \log(e + |x|^2), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

we obtain by direct calculations

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla(v \bar{x}^{-\delta})\|_{L^{2(2+\varepsilon)/(\varepsilon+2\delta+2)}} \\
&= \|\bar{x}^{-\delta} \nabla v - \delta v \bar{x}^{-\delta-1} \nabla \bar{x}\|_{L^{2(2+\varepsilon)/(\varepsilon+2\delta+2)}} \\
&\leq \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \|\bar{x}^{-\delta}\|_{L^{(2+\varepsilon)/\delta}} + 3\delta \|v \bar{x}^{-1}\|_{L^2} \|\bar{x}^{-\delta} \log(e + |x|^2)\|_{L^{(2+\varepsilon)/\delta}} \\
&\leq C \left(\|\nabla v\|_{L^2} + \varepsilon^{-1} \|v \bar{x}^{-1}\|_{L^2} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where in the last inequality we have used the following simple fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\bar{x}^{-\delta} \log(e + |x|^2)\|_{L^{(2+\varepsilon)/\delta}} \\
&\leq \left(\int \bar{x}^{-2-\varepsilon} \log^{(2+\varepsilon)/\delta}(e + |x|^2) dx \right)^{\delta/(2+\varepsilon)} \\
&\leq \left(\int \bar{x}^{-2} dx \right)^{\delta/(2+\varepsilon)} \|(e + |x|^2)^{-\varepsilon\delta/(2(2+\varepsilon))} \log(e + |x|^2)\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\leq C \delta^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

due to $(e + y)^{-\alpha} \log(e + y) \leq \alpha^{-1}$ for $\alpha > 0$ and any $y \geq 0$. The desired estimate (2.2) thus directly follows from (2.1) and (2.4). The proof of Lemma 2.3 is completed.

The following Hardy-type inequalities will play a crucial role in our analysis.

Lemma 2.4 *Let* $B_N \triangleq \{x| \, |x| < N\}$ *and* $\bar{x}$ *be as in* (1.7)*. Assume that* $\rho \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ *is a non-negative function such that*

$$\int_{B_{N_1}} \rho dx \geq M_1, \quad \int \rho^\gamma dx \leq M_2, \tag{2.5}$$

for positive constants $M_1, M_2, N_1,$ *and* $\gamma > 1$*. Then there is a positive constant* C *depending only on* $M_1, M_2, N_1,$ *and* γ*, such that every function* $v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ *satisfies*

$$\int \frac{v^2}{\bar{x}^2} dx \leq C \int \rho |v|^2 dx + C \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{2.6}$$

Moreover, if, in addition to (2.5)*,* ρ *satisfies*

$$\int \rho \bar{x}^\alpha dx \leq M_3, \tag{2.7}$$

for some positive constants α *and* M_3*, there exists a positive constant* C *depending only on* $\alpha, M_i (i = 1, 2, 3), N_1,$ *and* γ *such that every function* $v \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ *satisfies*

$$\|\rho v\|_{L^r} \leq C r^{1/2} (1 + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}) \left(\|\rho^{1/2} v\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \right), \tag{2.8}$$

for any $r \in (1, \infty)$.

Proof. First, it follows from (2.5) and the Poincaré type inequality [10, Lemma 3.2] that for any $N \geq N_1$, there exists a positive constant C depending only on $M_2, M_3, N,$ and γ, such that

$$\|v\|_{H^1(B_N)}^2 \leq C \int_{B_N} \rho |v|^2 dx + C \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(B_N)}^2. \tag{2.9}$$

Next, let $\psi(x)$ be a $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ function such that

$$0 \leq \psi \leq 1, \quad \psi = \begin{cases} 1 & |x| \geq 3, \\ 0 & |x| \leq 2, \end{cases} \quad |\nabla \psi| \leq 2.$$

Direct calculations lead to

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \int \frac{\psi(x)}{|x|^2 \log^2 |x|^2} |v|^2 dx \\ & = 2 \int \frac{\psi(x)(x \cdot \nabla) v \cdot v}{|x|^2 \log |x|^2} dx + \int \frac{x \cdot \nabla \psi(x)}{|x|^2 \log |x|^2} |v|^2 dx \\ & \leq \int \frac{\psi(x)}{|x|^2 \log^2 |x|^2} |v|^2 dx + C \|\nabla v\|_{L^2}^2 + C \int_{(2 \leq |x| \leq 3)} |v|^2 dx, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (2.9) shows (2.6).

Finally, for $r \in (1, \infty)$ and $\sigma = 4/(r(4+\alpha))$, it follows from Holder's inequality, (2.3), (2.6), and (2.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho v\|_{L^r} & \leq \|(\rho \bar{x}^\alpha)^\sigma\|_{L^{1/\sigma}} \|v \bar{x}^{-\alpha\sigma}\|_{L^{4/(\alpha\sigma)}} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}^{1-\sigma} \\ & \leq C r^{1/2} \left(\|\rho^{1/2} v\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \right) (1 + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}), \end{aligned}$$

which gives (2.8). We finish the proof of Lemma 2.4.

Next, let $\triangle^{-1}$ denote the Laplacian inverse and R_i be the usual Riesz transform on $\mathbb{R}^2$: $R_i = (-\triangle)^{-1/2}\partial_i$. Let $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\mathcal{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ stand for the usual Hardy and BMO space. Given a function b, define the linear operator

$$[b, R_iR_j](f) \triangleq bR_i \circ R_j(f) - R_i \circ R_j(bf),\ i, j = 1, 2.$$

The following properties of the commutator $[b, R_iR_j](f)$ will be useful for our analysis.

Lemma 2.5 *Let $b, f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then for $p \in (1, \infty)$, there is $C(p)$ such that*

$$\|[b, R_iR_j](f)\|_{L^p} \le C(p)\|b\|_{\mathcal{BMO}}\|f\|_{L^p}. \tag{2.10}$$

Moreover, for $q_i \in (1, \infty)(i = 1, 2, 3)$ with $q_1^{-1} = q_2^{-1} + q_3^{-1}$, there is C depending only on $q_i(i = 1, 2, 3)$ such that

$$\|\nabla[b, R_iR_j](f)\|_{L^{q_1}} \le C\|\nabla b\|_{L^{q_2}}\|f\|_{L^{q_3}}. \tag{2.11}$$

Remark 2.1 *Properties (2.10) and (2.11) are due to Coifman-Rochberg-Weiss [5] and Coifman-Meyer [6] respectively.*

Next, we state the following Beale-Kato-Majda type inequality which was proved in [1, 18] when $\mathrm{div}u \equiv 0$ and will be used later to estimate $\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^p}$.

Lemma 2.6 ([1, 18]) *For $2 < q < \infty$, there is a constant $C(q)$ such that the following estimate holds for all $\nabla u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap W^{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^2)$,*

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} \le C\left(\|\mathrm{div}u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\mathrm{rot}u\|_{L^\infty}\right)\log(e + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}) + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + C.$$

Finally, the following Brezis-Wainger inequality will also be used.

Lemma 2.7 ([2, 8]) *For $q > 2$, there exists some positive constant C depending only on q such that every function $v \in \left\{v \in W^{1,q}\middle|\ \nabla v \in L^2\right\}$ satisfies*

$$\|v\|_{L^\infty} \le C(\|v\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^2})\ln^{1/2}(e + \|\nabla v\|_{W^{1,q}}) + C. \tag{2.12}$$

3 A priori estimates (I): upper bound of the density

In this section and the next, we will always assume that

$$\rho_0(x) > 0, \tag{3.1}$$

in addition to the conditions of Theorem 1.1, and that (ρ, u) is the strong solution to (1.1)-(1.4) on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, T]$ obtained by Lemma 2.1. Without loss of generality, assume that

$$\int \rho_0 dx = 1,$$

which implies that there exists a positive constant N_0 such that

$$\int_{B_{N_0}} \rho_0 dx \ge \frac{1}{2}\int \rho_0 dx = \frac{1}{2}. \tag{3.2}$$

The following Proposition 3.1 will give an upper bound of the density which is the key to obtain higher order estimates.

Proposition 3.1 *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, for*

$$E_0 \triangleq \|\rho_0\|_{L^1} + \|\rho_0\bar{x}^a\|_{L^1} + \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} + \|\rho_0^{1/2}u_0\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla u_0\|_{L^2},$$

there is a positive constant C depending only on $\mu, \beta, \gamma, T, N_0, a,$ and E_0 such that

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}(\|\rho\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}) + \int_0^T\int\rho|u_t + u\cdot\nabla u|^2dxdt \le C. \tag{3.3}$$

Before proving Proposition 3.1, we establish some a priori estimates, Lemmas 3.2–3.6. First, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2 *There exist positive constants C and N_1 both depending only on a, γ, T, N_0, $\|\rho_0\|_{L^1}$, $\|\rho_0\bar{x}^a\|_{L^1}$, $\|\rho_0\|_{L^\gamma}$, and $\|\rho_0^{1/2}u_0\|_{L^2}$ such that*

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int\left(\rho|u|^2 + \rho^\gamma + \rho\bar{x}^a\right)dx + \int_0^T\int\left(\mu|\nabla u|^2 + \lambda(\rho)(\mathrm{div}u)^2\right)dxdt \le C, \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\int_{B_{N_1}}\rho dx \ge 1/4. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. First, the mass conservation equation $(1.1)_1$ yields

$$\int\rho dx = \int\rho_0 dx = 1. \tag{3.6}$$

Next, the standard energy inequality reads:

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int\left(\rho|u|^2 + \rho^\gamma\right)dx + \int_0^T\int\left(\mu|\nabla u|^2 + (\mu + \lambda(\rho))(\mathrm{div}u)^2\right)dxdt \le \tilde{C}. \tag{3.7}$$

Multiplying $(1.1)_1$ by $\bar{x}^a$ and integrating the resulting equality over $\mathbb{R}^2$, we obtain after integration by parts and using (3.7) that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\int\rho\bar{x}^a dx &\le C\int\rho|u|\bar{x}^{a-1}\log(e+|x|^2)dx\\ &\le C\left(\int\rho\bar{x}^{2a-2}\log^2(e+|x|^2)dx\right)^{1/2}\left(\int\rho u^2dx\right)^{1/2}\\ &\le C\left(\int\rho\bar{x}^a dx\right)^{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

which together with Gronwall's inequality gives

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int\rho\bar{x}^a dx \le C. \tag{3.8}$$

This as well as (3.7) gives (3.4).

Finally, for $N > 1$, let $\varphi_N(x)$ be a $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ function such that

$$0 \le \varphi_N(x) \le 1, \quad \varphi_N = \begin{cases}1 & \text{if } |x| \le N,\\ 0 & \text{if } |x| \ge 2N,\end{cases} \quad |\nabla\varphi_N| \le 2N^{-1}.$$

It follows from $(1.1)_1$, (3.6), and (3.7) that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\int \rho\varphi_N dx &= \int \rho u\cdot\nabla\varphi_N dx\\ &\ge -2N^{-1}\left(\int\rho dx\right)^{1/2}\left(\int\rho|u|^2dx\right)^{1/2}\ge -2\tilde{C}^{1/2}N^{-1},\end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\int \rho\varphi_N dx \ge \int\rho_0\varphi_N dx - 2\tilde{C}^{1/2}N^{-1}T. \tag{3.9}$$

It thus follows from (3.2) and (3.9) that for $N_1 \triangleq 2(2+N_0+8\tilde{C}^{1/2}T)$,

$$\int_{B_{N_1}}\rho dx \ge \int\rho\varphi_{N_1/2}dx \ge 1/4,$$

which shows (3.5). The proof of Lemma 3.2 is completed.

Lemma 3.3 *Assume that* (1.5) *holds. Then there is a positive constant* C *depending only on* $\mu,\beta,\ \gamma,T,N_0,a,$ *and* E_0 *such that*

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int\left(\rho+\rho^{2\beta\gamma+1}\right)dx\le C. \tag{3.10}$$

Proof. First, we denote by

$$\nabla^\perp=(\partial_2,-\partial_1),\quad \frac{D}{Dt}f=\dot f=f_t+u\cdot\nabla f,$$

where $\frac{D}{Dt}f$ is the material derivative of f. Let G and ω be the effective viscous flux and the vorticity respectively as follows:

$$G\triangleq(2\mu+\lambda(\rho))\mathrm{div}u-P,\quad \omega\triangleq\nabla^\perp\cdot u=\partial_2u_1-\partial_1u_2.$$

We thus rewrite the momentum equations $(1.1)_2$ as

$$\rho\dot u=\nabla G+\mu\nabla^\perp\omega, \tag{3.11}$$

which shows that G solves

$$\triangle G=\mathrm{div}(\rho\dot u)=\partial_t(\mathrm{div}(\rho u))+\mathrm{divdiv}(\rho u\otimes u).$$

This implies

$$G+\frac{D}{Dt}\left((-\triangle)^{-1}\mathrm{div}(\rho u)\right)=F, \tag{3.12}$$

with the commutator F defined by

$$F\triangleq\sum_{i,j=1}^2[u_i,R_iR_j](\rho u_j). \tag{3.13}$$

Then, since $\rho>0$ due to (3.1), the mass equation $(1.1)_1$ leads to

$$-\mathrm{div}u=\frac{1}{\rho}D_t\rho,$$

which combining with (3.12) gives that

$$\frac{D}{Dt}\theta(\rho)+P=\frac{D}{Dt}\psi-F, \tag{3.14}$$

with

$$\theta(\rho)\triangleq 2\mu\log\rho+\beta^{-1}\rho^{\beta},\quad \psi\triangleq(-\triangle)^{-1}\mathrm{div}(\rho u). \tag{3.15}$$

Next, denoting $f\triangleq\max\{\theta(\rho)-\psi,0\}$, multiplying (3.14) by $\rho f^{2\gamma-1}$, and integrating the resulting equality over $\mathbb{R}^2$ lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\int\rho f^{2\gamma}dx&\le C\int\rho f^{2\gamma-1}|F|dx\\&\le C\|\rho^{1/(2\gamma)}f\|_{L^{2\gamma}}^{2\gamma-1}\|\rho\|_{L^{2\beta\gamma+1}}^{1/(2\gamma)}\|F\|_{L^{(2\beta\gamma+1)/\beta}}\\&\le C\|\rho^{1/(2\gamma)}f\|_{L^{2\gamma}}^{2\gamma-1}\|\rho\|_{L^{2\beta\gamma+1}}^{1/(2\gamma)}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\rho u\|_{L^{(2\beta\gamma+1)/\beta}},\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

where in the last inequality we have used the following simple fact that for any $p\in(1,\infty)$,

$$\|F\|_{L^p}\le C(p)\|u\|_{\mathcal{BMO}}\|\rho u\|_{L^p}\le C(p)\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\rho u\|_{L^p}, \tag{3.17}$$

due to (2.10). It follows from Holder inequality, (3.4), (3.5), (2.3), and (2.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\rho u\|_{L^{(2\beta\gamma+1)/\beta}}&\le\|(\rho\bar{x}^{a})^{\sigma}\|_{L^{1/\sigma}}\|u\bar{x}^{-a\sigma}\|_{L^{4/(a\sigma)}}\|\rho^{1-\sigma}\|_{L^{(2\beta\gamma+1)/(1-\sigma)}}\\&\le C(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2})\left(1+\|\rho\|_{L^{2\beta\gamma+1}}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

where $\sigma=4(\beta-1)/((4+a)(2\beta\gamma+1)-4)$. Substituting (3.18) into (3.16) gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int\rho f^{2\gamma}dx\le C\left(1+\int\rho f^{2\gamma}dx+\int\rho^{2\beta\gamma+1}dx\right)(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2), \tag{3.19}$$

due to $\beta>1$.

Next, one deduces from (3.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}\int\rho^{2\gamma\beta+1}dx&=\int_{(\rho\le 2)}\rho^{2\gamma\beta+1}dx+\int_{(\rho>2)}\rho^{2\gamma\beta+1}dx\\&\le C\int_{(\rho\le 2)}\rho dx+C\int_{(\rho>2)}\rho f^{2\gamma}dx+C\int\rho|\psi|^{2\gamma}dx\\&\le C+C\int\rho f^{2\gamma}dx+C\int\rho|\psi|^{2\gamma}dx.\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

It follows from (2.1) and (3.4) that for any $q\in(2,\infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\psi\|_{L^q}&\le C\|\nabla(-\triangle)^{-1}\mathrm{div}(\rho u)\|_{L^{2q/(q+2)}}\\&\le C(q)\|\rho^{1/2}\|_{L^q}\|\rho^{1/2}u\|_{L^2}\le C(q)\|\rho\|_{L^{q/2}}^{1/2},\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

which as well as (3.6) and the fact that $\beta>1$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\int\rho|\psi|^{2\gamma}dx&\le C\|\rho\|_{L^{(2\beta\gamma+1)/(2\beta\gamma+1-\gamma)}}\|\psi\|_{L^{2(2\beta\gamma+1)}}^{2\gamma}\\&\le C(1+\|\rho\|_{L^{2\beta\gamma+1}})\|\rho\|_{L^{2\beta\gamma+1}}^{\gamma}\\&\le C(\varepsilon)+\varepsilon\int\rho^{2\gamma\beta+1}dx.\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Substituting (3.22) into (3.20) and choosing ε suitably small lead to

$$\int \rho^{2\gamma\beta+1} dx \le C + C \int \rho f^{2\gamma} dx, \tag{3.23}$$

which together with (3.19), (3.4), and Gronwall's inequality yields

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} \int \rho f^{2\gamma} dx \le C.$$

This combining with (3.23) and (3.6) directly gives (3.10). The proof of Lemma 3.3 is completed.

The following L^p-estimate of the momentum will play a key role in the estimate of the upper bound of the density.

Lemma 3.4 *Assume that* (1.5) *holds. Then, for any* $p > 4$, *there is a positive constant* $C(p)$ *depending only on* $p, \mu, \beta, \gamma, T, N_0, a,$ *and* E_0 *such that*

$$\|\rho u\|_{L^p} \le C(p) R_T^{1+\beta/4} (1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2})^{1-2/p}, \tag{3.24}$$

where

$$R_T \triangleq 1 + \sup_{0\le t\le T} \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Proof. First, for

$$\nu \triangleq \frac{\mu^{1/2}}{2(\mu+1)} R_T^{-\beta/2} \in (0, 1/4],$$

multiplying $(1.1)_2$ by $(2+\nu)|u|^\nu u$ and integrating the resulting equation over $\mathbb{R}^2$ lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\int \rho|u|^{2+\nu}dx + (2+\nu)\int |u|^\nu \left(\mu|\nabla u|^2 + (\mu+\rho^\beta)(\mathrm{div}u)^2\right)dx \\
&\le (2+\nu)\nu \int (\mu+\rho^\beta)|\mathrm{div}u||u|^\nu|\nabla u|dx + C\int \rho^\gamma |u|^\nu |\nabla u| dx \\
&\le \frac{2+\nu}{2}\int (\mu+\rho^\beta)(\mathrm{div}u)^2|u|^\nu dx + \frac{(2+\nu)\mu}{8(\mu+1)}\int |u|^\nu|\nabla u|^2dx \\
&\quad + \mu\int |u|^\nu|\nabla u|^2 dx + C\int \rho|u|^{2+\nu}dx + C\int \rho^{(2+\nu)\gamma-\nu/2}dx,
\end{aligned}$$

which together with Gronwall's inequality and (3.10) thus gives

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int \rho|u|^{2+\nu}dx \le C. \tag{3.25}$$

Then, it follows from Holder's inequality, (3.25), (3.4), (3.5), and (2.8) that for $r = (p-2)(2+\nu)/\nu$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\rho u\|_{L^p} &\le \|\rho u\|_{L^{2+\nu}}^{2/p}\|\rho u\|_{L^r}^{1-2/p} \\
&\le CR_T^{(1+\nu)/p}\|\rho^{1/(2+\nu)}u\|_{L^{2+\nu}}^{2/p}\left(r^{1/2}R_T(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2})\right)^{1-2/p} \\
&\le C(p)R_T^{(1+\nu)/p}\left(R_T^{1+\beta/4}(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2})\right)^{1-2/p} \\
&\le C(p)R_T^{1+\beta/4}(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2})^{1-2/p},
\end{aligned}$$

which shows (3.24). The proof of Lemma 3.4 is completed.

Lemma 3.5 *Assume that* (1.5) *holds. Then, for any* $\delta \in (0, \min\{1, 2(\beta-1)\})$, *there is a constant* $C(\delta)$ *depending only on* $\delta, \mu, \beta, \gamma, T, N_0, a,$ *and* E_0 *such that*

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} \log(e + A^2(t)) + \int_0^T \frac{B^2(t)}{e + A^2(t)} dt \le C(\delta) R_T^{1+\delta\beta}, \tag{3.26}$$

where

$$A^2(t) \triangleq \int \left(\omega^2(t) + \frac{G^2(t)}{2\mu + \lambda(\rho(t))} \right) dx, \quad B^2(t) \triangleq \int \rho(t) |\dot{u}(t)|^2 dx. \tag{3.27}$$

Proof. First, direct calculations show that

$$\nabla^\perp \cdot \dot{u} = \frac{D}{Dt}\omega - (\partial_1 u \cdot \nabla) u_2 + (\partial_2 u \cdot \nabla) u_1 = \frac{D}{Dt}\omega + \omega \mathrm{div} u, \tag{3.28}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{div}\dot{u} &= \frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u + (\partial_1 u \cdot \nabla) u_1 + (\partial_2 u \cdot \nabla) u_2 \\ &= \frac{D}{Dt}\mathrm{div}u - 2\nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp u_2 + (\mathrm{div}u)^2 \\ &= \frac{D}{Dt}(\frac{G}{2\mu+\lambda}) + \frac{D}{Dt}(\frac{P}{2\mu+\lambda}) - 2\nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp u_2 + (\mathrm{div}u)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

Then, multiplying (3.11) by $2\dot{u}$ and integrating the resulting equality over $\mathbb{R}^2$, we obtain after using (3.28) and (3.29) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} A^2 + 2B^2 = & - \int \omega^2 \mathrm{div} u dx + 4 \int G \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp u_2 dx - 2 \int G (\mathrm{div} u)^2 dx \\ & - \int \frac{(\beta-1)\lambda - 2\mu}{(2\mu+\lambda)^2} G^2 \mathrm{div} u dx + 2\beta \int \frac{\lambda(\rho) P}{(2\mu+\lambda)^2} G \mathrm{div} u dx \\ & - 2\gamma \int \frac{P}{2\mu+\lambda} G \mathrm{div} u dx = \sum_{i=1}^6 I_i. \end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

Each I_i can be estimated as follows:

First, it follows from (3.11) that

$$\triangle G = \mathrm{div}(\rho\dot{u}), \quad \mu \triangle \omega = \nabla^\perp \cdot (\rho \dot{u}). \tag{3.31}$$

which together with the standard L^p-estimate of elliptic equations yields that for $p \in (1, \infty)$,

$$\|\nabla G\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla \omega\|_{L^p} \le C(p, \mu) \|\rho \dot{u}\|_{L^p}. \tag{3.32}$$

In particular, we have

$$\|\nabla G\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla \omega\|_{L^2} \le C(\mu) R_T^{1/2} B. \tag{3.33}$$

This combining with (2.1) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\omega\|_{L^4} &\le C \|\omega\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla \omega\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \\ &\le C R_T^{1/4} A^{1/2} B^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

which leads to

$$|I_1| \le C\|\omega\|_{L^4}^2 \|\mathrm{div} u\|_{L^2} \le \varepsilon B^2 + C(\varepsilon) R_T \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 A^2. \tag{3.35}$$

Next, we will use an idea due to Perepelitsa [26] to estimate I_2. Noticing that

$$\mathrm{rot}\nabla u_1 = 0, \quad \mathrm{div}\nabla^\perp u_2 = 0,$$

one thus derives from [7, Theorem II.1] that

$$\|\nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp u_2\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \le C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2.$$

This combining with the fact that $\mathcal{BMO}$ is the dual space of $\mathcal{H}^1$ (see [9]) gives

$$\begin{aligned} |I_2| &\le C\|G\|_{\mathcal{BMO}} \|\nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla^\perp u_2\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} \\ &\le C\|\nabla G\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\le C R_T^{1/2} B \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} (1 + A) \\ &\le \varepsilon B^2 + C(\varepsilon) R_T \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 (1 + A^2), \end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

where in the third inequality we have used (3.33) and the following simple fact that for $t \in [0, T]$,

$$C^{-1}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 - C \le A^2(t) \le C R_T^\beta \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 + C, \tag{3.37}$$

due to (3.10).

Next, Holder's inequality yields that for $\delta \in (0, 2(\beta - 1))$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=3}^{6} |I_i| &\le C \int |\mathrm{div} u| \left(|G| \frac{|G| + P}{2\mu + \lambda} + \frac{G^2}{2\mu + \lambda} + \frac{P|G|}{2\mu + \lambda} \right) dx \\ &\le C \int \frac{G^2 |\mathrm{div} u|}{2\mu + \lambda} dx + C \int \frac{P|G|}{2\mu + \lambda} |\mathrm{div} u| dx \\ &\le C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \left\| \frac{G^2}{2\mu + \lambda} \right\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|G\|_{L^{2(2+\delta)/\delta}} \|P\|_{L^{2+\delta}} \\ &\le C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \left\| \frac{G^2}{2\mu + \lambda} \right\|_{L^2} + C(\delta) \|\nabla u\|_{L^2} \|G\|_{L^2}^{\delta/(2+\delta)} \|\nabla G\|_{L^2}^{2/(2+\delta)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (3.10) and (2.1).

Then, noticing that (3.27) gives

$$\|G\|_{L^2} \le C R_T^{\beta/2} A, \tag{3.39}$$

one deduces from the Holder inequality and (2.1) that for $0 < \delta < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{G^2}{\sqrt{2\mu + \lambda}} \right\|_{L^2} &\le C \left\| \frac{G}{\sqrt{2\mu + \lambda}} \right\|_{L^2}^{1-\delta} \|G\|_{L^{2(1+\delta)/\delta}}^{1+\delta} \\ &\le C(\delta) A^{1-\delta} \|G\|_{L^2}^{\delta} \|\nabla G\|_{L^2} \\ &\le C(\delta) A R_T^{\delta\beta/2} \|\nabla G\|_{L^2} \\ &\le C(\delta) R_T^{(1+\delta\beta)/2} A B, \end{aligned} \tag{3.40}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (3.33). It follows from (3.38), (3.33), (3.40), and (3.39) that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=3}^{6}|I_i| &\le C(\delta)R_T^{(1+\delta\beta)/2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\left(AB+A^{\delta/(2+\delta)}B^{2/(2+\delta)}\right)\\ &\le C(\delta)R_T^{(1+\delta\beta)/2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}(AB+B+A)\\ &\le \varepsilon B^2+C(\varepsilon,\delta)R_T^{1+\delta\beta}(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2)(1+A^2).\end{aligned}\tag{3.41}$$

Finally, substituting (3.35), (3.36), and (3.41) into (3.30), we obtain after choosing $\varepsilon>0$ suitably small that

$$\frac{d}{dt}A^2+B^2\le C(\delta)R_T^{1+\delta\beta}(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2)(1+A^2).\tag{3.42}$$

Dividing (3.42) by $e+A^2$ together with (3.4) gives (3.26). The proof of Lemma 3.5 is completed.

Next, the following lemma gives an estimate of the L^∞-norm of the commutator F defined by (3.13).

Lemma 3.6 *Assume that* (1.5) *holds. Then, for any* $\varepsilon>0$, *there is a positive constant* $C(\varepsilon)$ *depending only on* $\varepsilon,\mu,\beta,\ \gamma,T,N_0,a,$ *and* E_0 *such that*

$$\int_0^T\|F\|_{L^\infty}dt\le C(\varepsilon)R_T^{1+\beta/4+\varepsilon}.\tag{3.43}$$

Proof. First, it follows from the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, (3.17), and (2.11) that for $p\in(8,\infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|F\|_{L^\infty}&\le C(p)\|F\|_{L^p}^{(p-4)/p}\|\nabla F\|_{L^{4p/(p+4)}}^{4/p}\\ &\le C(p)\left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\rho u\|_{L^p}\right)^{(p-4)/p}\left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}\|\rho u\|_{L^p}\right)^{4/p}\\ &\le C(p)\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{(p-4)/p}\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^{4/p}\|\rho u\|_{L^p}\\ &\le C(p)R_T^{1+\beta/4}\left(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\right)^{2-6/p}\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^{4/p},\end{aligned}\tag{3.44}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (3.24).

Next, we obtain from (3.34), (3.40), (3.37), and (3.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}&\le C(\|\mathrm{div}u\|_4+\|\omega\|_4)\\ &\le C\left\|\frac{G+P}{2\mu+\lambda}\right\|_{L^4}+CR_T^{1/4}A^{1/2}B^{1/2}\\ &\le C\left\|\frac{G^2}{\sqrt{2\mu+\lambda}}\right\|_{L^2}^{1/2}+C\left\|\frac{P}{2\mu+\lambda}\right\|_{L^4}+CR_T^{1/4}A^{1/2}B^{1/2}\\ &\le CR_TA^{1/2}B^{1/2}+CR_T^{\gamma}\\ &\le CR_T^{2\beta\gamma}(e+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2})\left(1+\frac{B^2}{e+A^2}\right)^{1/4}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.45}$$

Substituting (3.45) into (3.44) yields that for $p > 8$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|F\|_{L^\infty} &\le C(p)R_T^{1+\beta/4+8\beta\gamma/p}\left(e+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\right)^{2-2/p}\left(1+\frac{B^2}{e+A^2}\right)^{1/p}\\ &\le C(p)R_T^{1+\beta p/(4(p-1))+9\beta\gamma/(p-1)}\left(e+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2\right)+\frac{B^2}{e+A^2},\end{aligned}$$

which together with (3.26) and (3.4) directly gives (3.43) after choosing p suitably large. The proof of Lemma 3.6 is completed.

Now we are in a position to prove Proposition 3.1.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. For ψ as in (3.15), it follows from (3.21) and (3.4) that

$$\|\psi\|_{L^{2\gamma}} \le C,$$

which together with (2.12) and (3.24) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\|\psi\|_{L^\infty} &\le C\left(\|\psi\|_{L^{2\gamma}}+\|\nabla\psi\|_{L^2}\right)\log^{1/2}(e+\|\psi\|_{W^{1,2\gamma}})+C\\ &\le C\left(1+\|\rho u\|_{L^2}\right)\log^{1/2}(e+\|\rho u\|_{L^{2\gamma/(\gamma+2)}}+\|\rho u\|_{L^{4\gamma}})+C\\ &\le CR_T^{1/2}\log^{1/2}\left(R_T^{1+\beta/4}(e+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2})\right)+C\\ &\le CR_T^{1/2}\log^{1/2}(e+A^2)+CR_T\\ &\le CR_T^{4/3},\end{aligned} \tag{3.46}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (3.26). One thus derives from (3.14), (3.46) and (3.43) that for $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,

$$R_T^\beta \le C(\varepsilon)R_T^{\max\{1+\beta/4+\varepsilon,\ 4/3\}}.$$

Because of (1.5), after choosing ε suitably small, this directly gives

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}\|\rho\|_{L^\infty} \le C,$$

which together with (3.42), (3.4), and Gronwall's inequality yields (3.3). We complete the proof of Proposition 3.1.

4 A priori estimates (II): higher order estimates (I)

Lemma 4.1 *Assume that* (1.5) *holds. Then there is a positive constant C depending only on $\mu,\beta,\gamma,T,N_0,a,$ and E_0 such that*

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} t\int\rho|\dot u|^2dx+\int_0^T t\|\nabla\dot u\|_{L^2}^2dt \le C. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. First, simple calculations yield that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t\triangle u_j+\mathrm{div}(u\triangle u_j) &= \triangle\dot u_j-\triangle(u\cdot\nabla u_j)+\partial_i\mathrm{div}(u\partial_i u_j)-\mathrm{div}(\partial_i u\partial_i u_j)\\ &= \triangle\dot u_j+\partial_i(-\partial_i u\cdot\nabla u_j+\mathrm{div}u\partial_i u_j)-\mathrm{div}(\partial_i u\partial_i u_j).\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

It follows from $(1.1)_1$ that

$$\lambda_t+\mathrm{div}((\mu+\lambda)u)=(\mu+(1-\beta)\rho^\beta)\mathrm{div}u, \tag{4.3}$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_{jt}((\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u)+\mathrm{div}(u\partial_j((\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u))\\
&=\partial_j\left[(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}(\dot u-u\cdot\nabla u)+\lambda_t\mathrm{div}u+\mathrm{div}(u(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u)\right]\\
&\quad-\mathrm{div}(\partial_j u(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u)\\
&=\partial_j\Big[(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}\dot u-(\mu+\lambda)\partial_i u\cdot\nabla u_i+(\mu+(1-\beta)\rho^\beta)(\mathrm{div}u)^2\Big]\\
&\quad-\mathrm{div}(\partial_j u(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u).
\end{aligned}\tag{4.4}$$

Noticing that P satisfies

$$P_t+\mathrm{div}(Pu)=(1-\gamma)P\mathrm{div}u,\tag{4.5}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_j P_t+\mathrm{div}(\partial_j Pu)&=\partial_j P_t+\partial_j\mathrm{div}(Pu)-\mathrm{div}(P\partial_j u)\\
&=(1-\gamma)\partial_j(P\mathrm{div}u)-\mathrm{div}(P\partial_j u).
\end{aligned}\tag{4.6}$$

Then, operating $\partial/\partial t+\mathrm{div}(u\cdot)$ to $(1.1)_2^j$ together with (4.2), (4.4), and (4.6) shows

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\rho\dot u_j)_t+\mathrm{div}(\rho u\dot u_j)-\mu\triangle\dot u_j-\partial_j((\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}\dot u)\\
&=\mu\partial_i(-\partial_i u\cdot\nabla u_j+\mathrm{div}u\partial_i u_j)-\mu\mathrm{div}(\partial_i u\partial_i u_j)\\
&\quad-\partial_j\Big[(\mu+\lambda)\partial_i u\cdot\nabla u_i-(\mu+(1-\beta)\rho^\beta)(\mathrm{div}u)^2\Big]\\
&\quad-\mathrm{div}(\partial_j u(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u)+(\gamma-1)\partial_j(P\mathrm{div}u)+\mathrm{div}(P\partial_j u)\\
&\triangleq K.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.7}$$

Finally, multiplying (4.7) by $\dot u$, we obtain after integration by parts that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int\rho|\dot u|^2dx+\mu\int|\nabla\dot u|^2dx+\int(\mu+\lambda)(\mathrm{div}\dot u)^2dx\\
&\le\frac{\mu}{8}\int|\nabla\dot u|^2dx+C\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^4+C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\le\frac{\mu}{8}\int|\nabla\dot u|^2dx+C(\|G\|_{L^4}^4+\|\omega\|_{L^4}^4+\|P\|_{L^4}^4)+C\\
&\le\frac{\mu}{8}\int|\nabla\dot u|^2dx+C(\|G\|_{L^2}^2\|\nabla G\|_{L^2}^2+\|\omega\|_{L^2}^2\|\nabla\omega\|_{L^2}^2)+C\\
&\le\frac{\mu}{8}\int|\nabla\dot u|^2dx+C\|\rho^{1/2}\dot u\|_{L^2}^2+C,
\end{aligned}\tag{4.8}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (3.3) and (3.33). Multiplying (4.8) by t and integrating the resulting equation over $(0,T)$, we obtain (4.1) after using (3.3). We thus finish the proof of Lemma 4.1.

Proposition 4.2 *Assume that* (1.5) *holds and let* $q>2$ *be as in Theorem 1.1. Then there is a constant* C *depending only on* $q,\mu,\beta,\gamma,T,N_0,a,E_0$, *and* $\|\rho_0\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}}$ *such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left(\|\rho\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}}+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}+t\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\
&+\int_0^T\left(\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^q}^{(q+1)/q}+t\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^q}^2\right)dt\le C.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.9}$$

Proof. Following [15], we will prove (4.9). First, denoting by $\Phi \triangleq (\Phi^1, \Phi^2)$ with $\Phi^i \triangleq (2\mu + \lambda(\rho))\partial_i \rho$ $(i = 1, 2)$, one deduces from $(1.1)_1$ that Φ^i satisfies

$$\Phi^i_t + (u \cdot \nabla)\Phi^i + (2\mu + \lambda(\rho))\partial_i u^j \partial_j \rho + \rho\partial_i G + \rho\partial_i P + \Phi^i \mathrm{div} u = 0. \tag{4.10}$$

For $q > 2$, multiplying (4.10) by $|\Phi|^{q-2}\Phi^i$ and integrating the resulting equation over $\mathbb{R}^2$, we obtain after integration by parts that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\|\Phi\|_{L^q} &\le C(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q} + C\|\nabla G\|_{L^q} \\ &\le C(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q} + C\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^q}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

where in the second inequality we have used (3.32).

Next, noticing that the Gargliardo-Nirenberg inequality, (3.3), and (3.32) yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathrm{div} u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\omega\|_{L^\infty} &\le C\|G\|_{L^\infty} + C\|P\|_{L^\infty} + C\|\omega\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\le C(q) + C(q)\|\nabla G\|_{L^q}^{q/(2(q-1))} + C(q)\|\nabla\omega\|_{L^q}^{q/(2(q-1))} \\ &\le C(q) + C(q)\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^q}^{q/(2(q-1))}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

we deduce from standard L^p-estimate for elliptic system that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q} &\le C\|\nabla \mathrm{div} u\|_{L^q} + C\|\nabla\omega\|_{L^q} \\ &\le C\|\nabla((2\mu + \lambda)\mathrm{div} u)\|_{L^q} + C\|\mathrm{div} u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q} + C\|\nabla\omega\|_{L^q} \\ &\le C(\|\mathrm{div} u\|_{L^\infty} + 1)\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q} + C\|\nabla G\|_{L^q} + C\|\nabla\omega\|_{L^q} \\ &\le C(\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^q}^{q/(2(q-1))} + 1)\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q} + C\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^q} \\ &\le C\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}^{(2q-2)/(q-2)} + C\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^q} + C, \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

where in the fourth inequality we have used (3.32). This together with Lemma 2.6 and (4.12) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} &\le C\left(\|\mathrm{div} u\|_{L^\infty} + \|\omega\|_{L^\infty}\right)\log(e + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}) + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + C \\ &\le C\left(1 + \|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^q}^{q/(2(q-1))}\right)\log(e + \|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}) + C \\ &\le C\left(1 + \|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^q}\right)\log(e + \|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Next, it follows from Holder inequality, (3.4), (3.5), (2.8), and (3.3) that for any $p > 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^p} &\le \|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{2(p-1)/(p^2-2)}\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^{p^2}}^{p(p-2)/(p^2-2)} \\ &\le C(p)\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{2(p-1)/(p^2-2)}\left(\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)^{p(p-2)/(p^2-2)} \\ &\le C(p)\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + C(p)\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{2(p-1)/(p^2-2)}\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^{p(p-2)/(p^2-2)}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

which together with (3.3) and (4.1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \left(\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^p}^{1+1/p} + t\|\rho\dot{u}\|_{L^p}^2\right) dt \\ &\quad\le C(p)\int_0^T \left(\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + t\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + t^{-(p^3-p^2-2p)/(p^3-p^2-2p+2)}\right) dt \\ &\quad\le C(p). \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

Then, substituting (4.14) into (4.11), we deduce from Gronwall's inequality and (4.16) that

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}\le C, \tag{4.17}$$

which as well as (4.13) and (4.16) shows

$$\int_0^T\left(\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^q}^{(q+1)/q}+t\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^q}^2\right)dt\le C. \tag{4.18}$$

Finally, note that $\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^2}$ satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned}(\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^2})'&\le C(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}\\&\le C(1+\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^q})\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

We obtain from (3.3), (3.32), and (4.17) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}&\le C\|\nabla\omega\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla\mathrm{div}u\|_{L^2}\\&\le C\|\nabla\omega\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla((2\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u)\|_{L^2}+C\|\mathrm{div}u\|_{L^{2q/(q-2)}}\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}\\&\le C\|\nabla\omega\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla G\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla P\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{(q-2)/q}\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^{2/q}\\&\le C\|\rho\dot u\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^2}+\frac12\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2},\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

which together with (4.19), (3.3), (4.18), and (4.1) gives

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left(\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^2}+t\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2\right)+\int_0^T\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^2}^2dt\le C. \tag{4.21}$$

The combination of (4.17), (4.18), and (4.21) thus directly gives (4.9). We thus finish the proof of Proposition 4.2.

Proposition 4.3 *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, there is a constant C depending only on $q,\mu,\beta,\gamma,T,N_0,a,E_0$, $\|\rho_0\|_{H^1\cap W^{1,q}}$, and $\|\nabla(\bar x^a\rho_0)\|_{L^2\cap L^q}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left(\|\bar x^a\rho\|_{L^1\cap H^1\cap W^{1,q}}+\|\bar x^a\nabla\rho\|_{L^2\cap L^q}+\|\rho u\|_{H^1}\right)\\&+\sup_{0\le t\le T}t\left(\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|(\rho u)_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)+\int_0^T\left(\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2+\|(\rho u)_t\|_{L^2}^2\right)dt\le C.\end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

Proof. First, it follows from (3.4), (3.5), (2.2), (2.6), and (3.3) that for any $\varepsilon>0$ and any $s>2$,

$$\|u\bar x^{-\varepsilon}\|_{L^{s/\varepsilon}}\le C(\varepsilon,s). \tag{4.23}$$

Direct calculations show

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla(u\bar x^{-\varepsilon})\|_{L^q}&\le C\|\nabla u\|_{L^q}+C(\varepsilon)\|u\bar x^{-\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty}\|(e+|x|^2)^{-1/2}\|_{L^q}\\&\le C(\varepsilon)\|\nabla u\|_{L^q}+\frac12\|\nabla(u\bar x^{-\varepsilon})\|_{L^q}+C(\varepsilon)\|u\bar x^{-\varepsilon}\|_{L^{4/\varepsilon}},\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\|u\bar x^{-\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty}\le C(\varepsilon)+C(\varepsilon)\|\nabla u\|_{L^q}. \tag{4.24}$$

Next, one derives from $(1.1)_1$ that $v = \rho\bar{x}^a$ satisfies

$$v_t + u \cdot \nabla v - avu \cdot \nabla \log \bar{x} + v\mathrm{div} u = 0,$$

which together with simple calculations gives for any $p \in [2, q]$

$$\begin{aligned}
(\|\nabla v\|_{L^p})_t \le\ & C(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|u \cdot \nabla \log \bar{x}\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla v\|_{L^p} \\
& + C\|v\|_{L^\infty} \left(\||\nabla u||\nabla \log \bar{x}|\|_{L^p} + \||u||\nabla^2 \log \bar{x}|\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p}\right) \\
\le\ & C(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,q}})\|\nabla v\|_{L^p} \\
& + C\|v\|_{L^\infty} \left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^p} + \|u\bar{x}^{-1/4}\|_{L^\infty}\|\bar{x}^{-3/2}\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p}\right) \\
\le\ & C(1 + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,q}})(1 + \|\nabla v\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla v\|_{L^q}),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

where in the second and the last inequalities, we have used (4.24) and (3.4). Choosing $p = q$ in (4.25) together with (4.9) thus shows

$$\sup_{0 \le t \le T} \|\nabla(\rho\bar{x}^a)\|_{L^q} \le C. \tag{4.26}$$

Letting $p = 2$ in (4.25), we deduce from (4.9) and (4.26) that

$$\sup_{0 \le t \le T} \|\nabla(\rho\bar{x}^a)\|_{L^2} \le C,$$

which combining with (3.4) and (4.26) thus gives

$$\sup_{0 \le t \le T} \|\rho\bar{x}^a\|_{L^1 \cap H^1 \cap W^{1,q}} \le C. \tag{4.27}$$

This yields that for any $p \in [2, q]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\bar{x}^a \nabla\rho\|_{L^p} &\le C\|\nabla(\rho\bar{x}^a)\|_{L^p} + C\|\rho\bar{x}^{a-1} \log(e + |x|)\|_{L^p} \\
&\le C + C\|\rho\bar{x}^a\|_{L^\infty}^{1-1/p}\|\rho\bar{x}^a\|_{L^1}^{1/p}\|\bar{x}^{-1} \log(e + |x|)\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\le C,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

which as well as (3.4), (3.3), and (4.23) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\rho u\|_{H^1} \le & C + C\|\rho\nabla u\|_{L^2} + C\||u||\nabla\rho|\|_{L^2} \\
\le & C + C\|\bar{x}^{-a}u\|_{L^{2q/(q-2)}}\|\bar{x}^a\nabla\rho|\|_{L^q} \le C.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

Finally, it follows from (4.27), (3.3), and (4.24) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2} + \|(\rho u)_t\|_{L^2} \\
& \le C\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + C\|\rho^{1/2}u \cdot \nabla u\|_{L^2} + C\|\rho_t u\|_{L^2} \\
& \le C\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + C\|\rho^{1/2}|u||\nabla u|\|_{L^2} + C\||u|^2\nabla\rho\|_{L^2} \\
& \le C\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + C\|\bar{x}^{-a/2}u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2} + C\||u|^2\bar{x}^{-a}\|_{L^\infty}\|\bar{x}^a\nabla\rho\|_{L^2} \\
& \le C\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + C + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^q},
\end{aligned}$$

which together with (4.1), (3.3), and (4.9) shows

$$\sup_{0 \le t \le T} t\left(\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\rho u)_t\|_{L^2}^2\right) + \int_0^T \left(\|\rho^{1/2}u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|(\rho u)_t\|_{L^2}^2\right) dt \le C.$$

This combining with (4.27)-(4.29) yields (4.22). The proof of Proposition 4.2 is completed.

5 A priori estimates (III): higher order estimates (II)

In this section, in addition to the conditions of Theorem 1.2, we will always assume that $\rho_0(x) > 0$ and that (ρ, u) is the classical solution to (1.1)-(1.4) on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, T]$ obtained by Lemma 2.1. The following higher order estimates of the solutions which are needed to guarantee the extension of local classical solution to be a global one are similar to the ones in [21], and we sketch the proof of them here for completeness.

From now on, the positive constant C may depend on $q, \mu, \beta, \gamma, T, N_0, a, E_0, \|\nabla^2 u_0\|_{L^2}$, $\|\rho_0\|_{H^1\cap W^{2,q}}$, $\|\nabla(\bar{x}^a\rho_0)\|_{L^2\cap L^q}$, $\|\nabla^2(\bar{x}^{\delta_0}\rho_0)\|_{L^2}$, $\|\nabla^2(\bar{x}^{\delta_0}\lambda(\rho_0))\|_{L^2}$, $\|\nabla^2(\bar{x}^{\delta_0}P(\rho_0))\|_{L^2}$, and $\|g\|_{L^2}$, where g is as in (1.10).

Lemma 5.1 *The following estimates hold:*

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} t\left(\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}^2\right) + \int_0^T t\int\left(\rho|\dot{u}_t + u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}|^2 + |\nabla^2\dot{u}|^2\right)dxdt \le C, \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} t\|u_t\|_{L^2(B_R)} \le C(R), \tag{5.2}$$

for any $R > 0$.

Proof. First, taking into account on the compatibility condition (1.10), we can define

$$\sqrt{\rho}\dot{u}(x, t=0) = g.$$

Then we deduce from (4.8) and Gronwall's inequality that

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + \int_0^T\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \le C,$$

which combining with (4.20), (4.9), (3.3), (4.13), and (4.15) gives

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left(\|\nabla u\|_{H^1} + \|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right) + \int_0^T\left(\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}^2\right)dt \le C. \tag{5.3}$$

Next, multiplying (4.7) by $\partial_t\dot{u}_j + u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}_j$, summing with respect to j, and integrating the resulting equation over $\mathbb{R}^2$ lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\rho|\dot{u}_t + u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}|^2 dx - \mu\int\triangle\dot{u}_j(\partial_t\dot{u}_j + u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}_j)dx\\
&\quad - \int\partial_j((\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}\dot{u})(\partial_t\dot{u}_j + u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}_j)dx\\
&= \int K(\partial_t\dot{u}_j + u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}_j)dx,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

where K denotes the right-hand side of (4.7).

For the terms on the left-hand side of (5.4), direct calculations yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\triangle\dot{u}_j(\partial_t\dot{u}_j + u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}_j)dx\\
&= -\frac{1}{2}(\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2)_t - \int\partial_i\dot{u}_j\partial_i u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}_j dx - \int\partial_i\dot{u}_j u\cdot\nabla\partial_i\dot{u}_j dx\\
&\le -\frac{1}{2}(\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2)_t + C\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

and that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int \partial_j((\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}\dot{u})(\partial_t\dot{u}_j+u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}_j)dx\\
&=-\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int(\mu+\lambda)(\mathrm{div}\dot{u})^2dx+\frac{1}{2}\int(\lambda_t+\mathrm{div}((\mu+\lambda)u))(\mathrm{div}\dot{u})^2dx\\
&\quad-\int(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}\dot{u}\partial_j u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}_jdx\\
&\le-\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int(\mu+\lambda)(\mathrm{div}\dot{u})^2dx+C\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty},
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.6}
$$

where in the last inequality we have used (4.3).

We then estimate each term on the right-hand side of (5.4) as follows:

Integration by parts yields that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\int\mathrm{div}(\partial_j u(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u)(\partial_t\dot{u}_j+u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}_j)dx\\
&=\int(\partial_t\partial_k\dot{u}_j+\partial_k(u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}_j))\partial_j u_k(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u dx\\
&=\frac{d}{dt}\int\partial_k\dot{u}_j\partial_j u_k(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u dx-\int\partial_k\dot{u}_j\partial_j(\dot{u}_k-u\cdot\nabla u_k)(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u dx\\
&\quad-\int\partial_k\dot{u}_j\partial_j u_k(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}(\dot{u}-u\cdot\nabla u)dx-\int\partial_k\dot{u}_j\partial_j u_k\mathrm{div}u\lambda_t dx\\
&\quad+\int u\cdot\nabla(\partial_k\dot{u}_j)\partial_j u_k(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u dx+\int\partial_k u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}_j\partial_j u_k(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u dx\\
&=\frac{d}{dt}\int\partial_k\dot{u}_j\partial_j u_k(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u dx-\int\partial_k\dot{u}_j\partial_j\dot{u}_k(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u dx\\
&\quad+\int\partial_k\dot{u}_j\partial_j u\cdot\nabla u_k(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u dx-\int\partial_k\dot{u}_j\partial_j u_k(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}\dot{u}dx\\
&\quad+\int\partial_k\dot{u}_j\partial_j u_k(\mu+\lambda)\partial_i u\cdot\nabla u_i dx+\int\partial_k u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}_j\partial_j u_k(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u dx\\
&\quad-\int\partial_k\dot{u}_j\partial_j u_k\mathrm{div}u(\lambda_t+\mathrm{div}((\mu+\lambda)u)dx\\
&\le\frac{d}{dt}\int\partial_k\dot{u}_j\partial_j u_k(\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u dx+C\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}+C\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^6}^3,
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.7}
$$

where in the last inequality we have used (4.3).

Direct calculations give

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int \operatorname{div}(P\partial_j u)(\partial_t \dot u_j + u\cdot\nabla \dot u_j)dx\\
&= -\int (\partial_t\partial_k \dot u_j + \partial_k(u\cdot\nabla\dot u_j))P\partial_j u_k dx\\
&= -\frac{d}{dt}\int \partial_k\dot u_j P\partial_j u_k dx + \int \partial_k \dot u_j P_t \partial_j u_k dx + \int \partial_k\dot u_j P\partial_j(\dot u_k - u\cdot\nabla u_k)dx\\
&\quad -\int u\cdot\nabla(\partial_k\dot u_j)P\partial_j u_k dx - \int \partial_k u\cdot\nabla\dot u_j P\partial_j u_k dx\\
&= -\frac{d}{dt}\int \partial_k\dot u_j P\partial_j u_k dx + \int \partial_k\dot u_j P_t\partial_j u_k dx + \int \partial_k\dot u_j P\partial_j\dot u_k dx\\
&\quad -\int \partial_k\dot u_j P\partial_j u\cdot\nabla u_k dx - \int \partial_k\dot u_j P u\cdot\nabla\partial_j u_k dx\\
&\quad -\int u\cdot\nabla(\partial_k\dot u_j)P\partial_j u_k dx - \int \partial_k u\cdot\nabla\dot u_j P\partial_j u_k dx\\
&= -\frac{d}{dt}\int \partial_k\dot u_j P\partial_j u_k dx + \int \partial_k\dot u_j P\partial_j\dot u_k dx - \int \partial_k\dot u_j P\partial_j u\cdot\nabla u_k dx\\
&\quad +\int \partial_k\dot u_j(P_t + \operatorname{div}(Pu))\partial_j u_k dx - \int \partial_k u\cdot\nabla\dot u_j P\partial_j u_k dx\\
&\le -\frac{d}{dt}\int \partial_k\dot u_j P\partial_j u_k dx + C\|\nabla\dot u\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^4,
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.8}
$$

where in the last inequality we have used (4.5).

Similar to (5.7) and (5.8), we can estimate the other terms on the righthand side of (5.4). Therefore, substituting all these estimates (5.5)-(5.8) into (5.4) yields that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}I_0 + \int \rho|\dot u_t + u\cdot\nabla\dot u|^2 dx\\
&\le C(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla\dot u\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^4 + C\|\nabla\dot u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^6}^3,
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.9}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_0 \triangleq& \frac{\mu}{2}\|\nabla\dot u\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac12\int(\mu+\lambda)(\operatorname{div}\dot u)^2 dx\\
&-\mu\int\left(\partial_i\dot u_j\partial_i u\cdot\nabla u_j - \partial_i\dot u_j \operatorname{div}u\,\partial_i u_j + \partial_k\dot u_j\partial_i u_k\partial_i u_j\right)dx\\
&-\int \operatorname{div}\dot u\left[(\mu+\lambda)\partial_i u\cdot\nabla u^i - (\mu+(1-\beta)\rho^\beta)(\operatorname{div}u)^2\right]dx\\
&-\int \partial_k\dot u_j\partial_j u_k(\mu+\lambda)\operatorname{div}u dx + (\gamma-1)\int \operatorname{div}\dot u P\operatorname{div}u dx\\
&+\int \partial_k\dot u_j P\partial_j u_k dx,
\end{aligned}
$$

satisfies

$$
\frac{\mu}{4}\|\nabla\dot u\|_{L^2}^2 - C \le I_0 \le C\|\nabla\dot u\|_{L^2}^2 + C, \tag{5.10}
$$

due to (5.3). Multiplying (5.9) by t and integrating it over $(0,T)$, we obtain after using Gronwall's inequality, (4.9), (5.10), and (5.3), that

$$
\sup_{0\le t\le T} t\|\nabla\dot u\|_{L^2}^2 + \int_0^T t\int\rho|\dot u_t + u\cdot\nabla\dot u|^2 dxdt \le C, \tag{5.11}
$$

which together with (4.13), (4.15), (4.9), and (5.3) yields that

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} t\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}^2 \le C. \tag{5.12}$$

Finally, it follows from (4.7) that

$$\nabla((2\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}\dot{u}) = \nabla\triangle^{-1}\mathrm{div}(\rho\dot{u}_t + \rho u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}) - \nabla\triangle^{-1}\mathrm{div}K,$$

which yields that

$$\|\nabla((2\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}\dot{u})\|_{L^2} \le C\|\rho\dot{u}_t + \rho u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + C\|K\|_{L^2}. \tag{5.13}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\|\nabla(\nabla^\perp\cdot\dot{u})\|_{L^2} \le C\|\rho\dot{u}_t + \rho u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + C\|K\|_{L^2}. \tag{5.14}$$

Direct calculations show

$$\begin{aligned}\|K\|_{L^2} &\le C\||\nabla^2 u||\nabla u|\|_{L^2} + C\||\nabla\rho||\nabla u|^2\|_{L^2} + C\||\nabla\rho||\nabla u|\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}\\ &\le C\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|_{H^1} + C\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|_{H^1}^2 + C\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|_{H^1} + C\\ &\le C\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q} + C,\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (4.9) and (5.3).

Applying standard L^2-estimate to the elliptic system (4.7) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2} &\le C\|\nabla(\nabla^\perp\cdot\dot{u})\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla\mathrm{div}\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\\ &\le C\|\nabla(\nabla^\perp\cdot\dot{u})\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla((2\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}\dot{u})\|_{L^2}\\ &\quad + C\|\mathrm{div}\dot{u}\|_{L^{2q/(q-2)}}\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}\\ &\le C\|\rho^{1/2}(\dot{u}_t + u\cdot\nabla\dot{u})\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q} + C\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2},\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (4.9) and (5.13)-(5.15). This combining with (5.11) and (4.9) yields that

$$\int_0^T t\|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 dt \le C,$$

which together with (5.11) and (5.12) gives (5.1).

It only remains to prove (5.2). In fact, for any $R > 0$, it follows from (3.4), (3.5), (2.9), (5.1), and (5.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}t\|u_t\|_{L^2(B_R)} \le& t\|\dot{u}\|_{L^2(B_R)} + t\|u\cdot\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_R)}\\ \le& C(R)t\|\rho^{1/2}\dot{u}\|_{L^2(B_R)} + C(R)t\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2(B_R)}\\ &+ C(R)t\|u\|_{H^1(B_R)}\|\nabla u\|_{H^1(B_R)}\\ \le& C(R),\end{aligned}$$

which gives (5.2) and finishes the proof of Lemma 5.1.

The following Proposition 5.2 is concerned with the $W^{1,q}$-estimate ($q > 2$) on the gradients of density and pressure, which in particular indicates the Hölder continuity of $(\nabla\rho, \nabla P)$.

Proposition 5.2 *Let $q > 2$ and $\delta_0 \in (0,1)$ be as in Theorem 1.2. It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left(\|\nabla^2\rho\|_{L^2\cap L^q}+\|\nabla^2\lambda\|_{L^2\cap L^q}+\|\nabla^2P\|_{L^2\cap L^q}\right)\\&+\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left(\|\nabla^2(\bar{x}^{\delta_0}\rho)\|_{L^2}+\|\nabla^2(\bar{x}^{\delta_0}\lambda)\|_{L^2}+\|\nabla^2(\bar{x}^{\delta_0}P)\|_{L^2}\right)\le C.\end{aligned}\tag{5.17}$$

Proof. First, for any $p \ge 1$, $g(\rho) = \rho^p$ satisfies

$$g(\rho)_t + u\cdot\nabla g(\rho) + pg(\rho)\mathrm{div}u = 0.\tag{5.18}$$

Applying the differential operator ∇^2 to both sides of (5.18), multiplying the resulting equations by $q|\nabla^2 g(\rho)|^{q-2}\nabla^2 g(\rho)$, and integrating it by parts over $\mathbb{R}^2$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\|\nabla^2 g\|_{L^q}&\le C(p)\left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla^2 g\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla g\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla^2 u\|_{W^{1,q}}\right)\\&\le C(p)\left(1+\|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,q}}\right)\left(1+\|\nabla^2 g\|_{L^q}\right)+C(p)\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.19}$$

Next, it follows from (2.2), (2.6), and (5.3) that for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and any $s > 2$,

$$\|\dot{u}\bar{x}^{-\varepsilon}\|_{L^{s/\varepsilon}} \le C(\varepsilon,s) + C(\varepsilon,s)\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}.\tag{5.20}$$

which together with direct calculations leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla(\dot{u}\bar{x}^{-\varepsilon})\|_{L^q}&\le C(\varepsilon)\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^q}+C(\varepsilon)\|\dot{u}\bar{x}^{-\varepsilon}\|_{L^{q/\varepsilon}}\|(e+|x|^2)^{-1/2}\|_{L^{q/(1-\varepsilon)}}\\&\le C(\varepsilon)\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^q}+C(\varepsilon)+C(\varepsilon)\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.21}$$

The combination of (5.20) with (5.21) as well as the Sobolev inequality yields

$$\|\dot{u}\bar{x}^{-\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty} \le C(\varepsilon) + C(\varepsilon)\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2} + C(\varepsilon)\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^q}.\tag{5.22}$$

Next, noticing that the standard L^p-estimate to the elliptic system (3.31) gives

$$\|\nabla^2 G\|_{L^p} + \|\nabla^2\omega\|_{L^p} \le C(p,\mu)\|\nabla(\rho\dot{u})\|_{L^p},$$

direct calculations yield that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q}&\le C\left(\|\nabla(\nabla\mathrm{div}u)\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla(\nabla^\perp\omega)\|_{L^q}\right)\\&\le C\left(\|\nabla^2 G\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla(\mathrm{div}u\nabla\lambda)\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla(\nabla^\perp\omega)\|_{L^q}\right)\\&\le C\left(\|\nabla(\rho\dot{u})\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla^2\lambda\|_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\right)\\&\quad+C\|\nabla\lambda\|_{L^q}\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^\infty}\\&\le C\left(\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^q}+\|\bar{x}^a\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}\|\bar{x}^{-a}\dot{u}\|_{L^\infty}+\|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^q}\right)\\&\quad+C\|\nabla^2\lambda\|_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}+\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q}+C.\end{aligned}$$

This combining with (4.22) and (5.22) gives

$$\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q} \le C\left(\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}+\|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla^2\lambda\|_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,q}}+1\right).\tag{5.23}$$

Then, putting (5.23) into (5.19) shows

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\left(\|\nabla^2\rho\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla^2\lambda\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^q}\right)\\&\le C\left(1+\|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,q}}\right)\left(\|\nabla^2\rho\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla^2\lambda\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^q}\right)\\&\quad+C\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^q}+C\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}+C.\end{aligned}\tag{5.24}$$

It follows from (5.1) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \|\nabla \dot u\|_{L^q}^{1+1/q} dt &\le C \int_0^T \left((t\|\nabla \dot u\|_{L^2}^2)^{1/q} (t\|\nabla^2 \dot u\|_{L^2}^2)^{(q-2)/(2q)} t^{-1/2} \right)^{1+1/q} dt \\
&\le C \int_0^T \left(t\|\nabla^2 \dot u\|_{L^2}^2 + t^{-(q^2+q)/(q^2+q+2)} \right) dt \\
&\le C.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.25}
$$

Thus, by (5.24), (5.25), and Gronwall's inequality, one sees from (4.9) and (5.3) that

$$
\sup_{0\le t\le T} \left(\|\nabla^2 \rho\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla^2 \lambda\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla^2 P\|_{L^q} \right) \le C,
\tag{5.26}
$$

which, combining with (5.23), (5.25), (5.1), (4.9), and (5.3) gives

$$
\int_0^T \left(\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q}^{1+1/q} + t\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q}^2 \right) dt \le C.
\tag{5.27}
$$

Finally, for $v \triangleq \bar x^{\delta_0} g(\rho)$, it follows from (4.22) that

$$
\|v\|_{L^1\cap H^1 \cap W^{1,q}} \le C.
$$

Noticing that $(1.1)_1$ yields

$$
v_t + u\cdot\nabla v - \delta_0 v u \cdot \nabla \log \bar x + p v \mathrm{div} u = 0,
$$

we obtain from direct calculations that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^2})_t &\le C(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + \|u\cdot\nabla \log \bar x\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^2} + C\||\nabla^2 u||\nabla v|\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + C\||\nabla v||\nabla u||\nabla \log \bar x|\|_{L^2} + C\||\nabla v||u||\nabla^2 \log \bar x|\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + C(\|v\|_{L^1} + \|v\|_{L^\infty}) \left(\|\nabla^2 (u\cdot\nabla \log \bar x)\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q} \right) \\
&\le C(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla v\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + C\|\nabla v\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + C\|\nabla v\|_{L^2}\||u||\nabla^2 \log \bar x|\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\quad + C\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q} + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^q} + C\|u|\nabla^3 \log \bar x|\|_{L^q} + C\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q} \\
&\le C(1+\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q})(1+\|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^2}),
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.28}
$$

where in the second and third inequalities we have used the following simple fact that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$
\|u \bar x^{-\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty} \le C(\varepsilon),
\tag{5.29}
$$

due to (4.24) and (5.3). It thus follows from (5.28) and (5.27) that

$$
\sup_{0\le t\le T} \left(\|\nabla^2 (\bar x^{\delta_0} \rho)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 (\bar x^{\delta_0} \lambda)\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla^2 (\bar x^{\delta_0} P)\|_{L^2} \right) \le C,
\tag{5.30}
$$

which together with (4.22) gives

$$
\sup_{0\le t\le T} \left(\|\bar x^{\delta_0} \nabla^2 \rho\|_{L^2} + \|\bar x^{\delta_0} \nabla^2 \lambda\|_{L^2} + \|\bar x^{\delta_0} \nabla^2 P\|_{L^2} \right) \le C.
\tag{5.31}
$$

We thus directly deduce (5.17) from (5.26), (5.30), and (5.31). The proof of Proposition 5.2 is finished.

Lemma 5.3 *It holds that*

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} t\left(\|\rho^{1/2}u_{tt}\|_{L^2}+\|\rho^{1/2}(\dot u_t+u\cdot\nabla\dot u)\|_{L^2}\right)+\int_0^T t^2\|\nabla u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2dt\le C. \tag{5.32}$$

Proof. First, differentiating $(1.1)_2$ with respect to t gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\rho u_{tt}+\rho u\cdot\nabla u_t-\mu\Delta u_t-\nabla((\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u_t)\\ &=\nabla(\lambda_t\mathrm{div}u)-\rho_tu_t-\rho_tu\cdot\nabla u-\rho u_t\cdot\nabla u-\nabla P_t.\end{aligned} \tag{5.33}$$

Again, differentiating (5.33) with respect to t leads to

$$\begin{aligned}&\rho u_{ttt}+\rho u\cdot\nabla u_{tt}-\mu\Delta u_{tt}-\nabla((\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u_{tt})\\ &=2\nabla(\lambda_t\mathrm{div}u_t)+\nabla(\lambda_{tt}\mathrm{div}u)+2\mathrm{div}(\rho u)u_{tt}+\mathrm{div}(\rho u)_tu_t\\ &\quad-2(\rho u)_t\cdot\nabla u_t-\rho_{tt}u\cdot\nabla u-2\rho_tu_t\cdot\nabla u-\rho u_{tt}\cdot\nabla u-\nabla P_{tt},\end{aligned}$$

which, multiplied by u_{tt} and integrated by parts over $\mathbb{R}^2$, yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac12\frac{d}{dt}\int\rho|u_{tt}|^2dx+\int\left(\mu|\nabla u_{tt}|^2+(\mu+\lambda)|\mathrm{div}u_{tt}|^2\right)dx\\ &=-2\int\lambda_t\mathrm{div}u_t\mathrm{div}u_{tt}dx-\int\lambda_{tt}\mathrm{div}u\mathrm{div}u_{tt}dx\\ &\quad-4\int\rho u\cdot\nabla u_{tt}\cdot u_{tt}dx-\int(\rho u)_t\cdot\left(\nabla(u_t\cdot u_{tt})+2\nabla u_t\cdot u_{tt}\right)dx\\ &\quad-\int(\rho u)_t\cdot\nabla(u\cdot\nabla u\cdot u_{tt})dx-2\int\rho_tu_t\cdot\nabla u\cdot u_{tt}dx\\ &\quad-\int\rho u_{tt}\cdot\nabla u\cdot u_{tt}dx+\int P_{tt}\mathrm{div}u_{tt}dx\triangleq\sum_{i=1}^8J_i.\end{aligned} \tag{5.34}$$

The right-hand side of (5.34) can be estimated term by term as follows, using (2.1), Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the estimates obtained above.

First, it follows from (5.20), (5.29), and (5.3) that for any $\delta\in(0,1)$ and any $r>2/\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar x^{-\delta}u_t\|_{L^r}&\le C\|\bar x^{-\delta}\dot u\|_{L^r}+C\|\bar x^{-\delta}u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla u\|_{L^r}\\ &\le C(\delta,r)+C(\delta,r)\|\nabla\dot u\|_{L^2},\end{aligned} \tag{5.35}$$

and that for any $p\ge2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar x^{-\delta}\nabla u_t\|_{L^p}&\le C\|\bar x^{-\delta}\nabla\dot u\|_{L^p}+C\|\bar x^{-\delta}|u|^2|\nabla^2u|\|_{L^p}+C\|\bar x^{-\delta}|\nabla u|^2\|_{L^p}\\ &\le C\|\nabla\dot u\|_{L^p}+C\|\bar x^{-\delta/2}u\|_{L^\infty}^2\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^p}+C(p)\\ &\le C\|\nabla\dot u\|_{L^p}+C(\delta)\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^p}+C(p).\end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

Since $\lambda=\rho^\beta$, we deduce from (4.27) and (5.29) that

$$\begin{aligned}|J_1|&\le\varepsilon\|\nabla u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2+C(\varepsilon)\int(|u|^2|\nabla\lambda|^2+\lambda^2|\nabla u|^2)|\nabla u_t|^2dx\\ &\le\varepsilon\|\nabla u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2+C(\varepsilon)\int(\bar x^{a(1-\beta)}|u|^2|\nabla\rho|^2+|\nabla u|^2)(\bar x^{a(1-\beta)}|\nabla u_t|^2)dx\\ &\le\varepsilon\|\nabla u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2+C(\varepsilon)(\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^\infty}^2+\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2)\|\bar x^{a(1-\beta)/2}\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2+C(\varepsilon)\\ &\le\varepsilon\|\nabla u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2+C(\varepsilon)(1+\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2)\|\nabla\dot u\|_{L^2}^2+C(\varepsilon),\end{aligned} \tag{5.37}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (5.27) and (5.36).

Next, Cauchy inequality gives

$$|J_2| \le \varepsilon \|\nabla u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\varepsilon)\|\lambda_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}^2. \tag{5.38}$$

One deduces from $(1.1)_1$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\lambda_{tt}\|_{L^2} &\le C\|(u\cdot\nabla\lambda)_t\|_{L^2} + C\|(\lambda \mathrm{div} u)_t\|_{L^2} \\ &\le C\||u_t||\nabla\lambda|\|_{L^2} + C\||u||\nabla\lambda_t|\|_{L^2} + C\|\lambda_t \mathrm{div} u\|_{L^2} + C\|\lambda \mathrm{div} u_t\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.39}$$

Each term on the right-hand side of (5.39) can be estimated as follows:

It follows from (4.22), (5.35), and (5.27) that

$$\begin{aligned} \||u_t||\nabla\lambda|\|_{L^2} &\le C\|\bar{x}^{1-\beta}|u_t||\nabla\rho|\|_{L^2} \\ &\le C\|\bar{x}^{-1/3}u_t\|_{L^{12}}\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^{12/5}} \\ &\le C(1+\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}), \end{aligned} \tag{5.40}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(1+|u|)|\nabla\lambda_t|\|_{L^2} \\ &\le C\|(1+|u|)(|u||\nabla^2\lambda| + |\nabla u||\nabla\lambda| + \lambda|\nabla^2 u|)\|_{L^2} \\ &\le C\|(1+|u|)^2\bar{x}^{-\delta_0}\|_{L^\infty}\|\bar{x}^{\delta_0}\nabla^2\lambda\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + C\|(1+|u|)\bar{x}^{-a}\|_{L^\infty}\left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2q/(q-2)}}\|\bar{x}^a\nabla\rho\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2}\right) \\ &\le C, \end{aligned} \tag{5.41}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (5.31) and (5.29).

One obtains from (5.29), (5.3), and (4.22) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\lambda_t\|_{L^2} + \|P_t\|_{L^2} &\le C\||u|(|\nabla\lambda| + |\nabla P|)|\nabla u|\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^2 \\ &\le C\||u|\bar{x}^{-a}\|_{L^\infty}\|\bar{x}^a(|\nabla\lambda| + |\nabla P|)\|_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2q/(q-2)}} + C \\ &\le C, \end{aligned} \tag{5.42}$$

which directly gives

$$\|\lambda_t \mathrm{div} u\|_{L^2} \le C\|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,q}}. \tag{5.43}$$

It follows from (4.22) and (5.36) that

$$\|\lambda \mathrm{div} u_t\|_{L^2} \le C(1+\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}). \tag{5.44}$$

Putting (5.40), (5.41), (5.43), and (5.44) into (5.39) leads to

$$\|\lambda_{tt}\|_{L^2} \le C(1+\|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,q}} + \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}), \tag{5.45}$$

which together with (5.38) gives

$$|J_2| \le \varepsilon\|\nabla u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\varepsilon)(1+\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q} + \|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2)\|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,q}}^2. \tag{5.46}$$

Next, Cauchy inequality combining with (4.22) and (5.29) yields that

$$|J_3| \le C\|\bar{x}^{-a/2}u\|_{L^\infty}\|\rho^{1/2}u_{tt}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u_{tt}\|_{L^2} \le \varepsilon\|\nabla u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2 + C(\varepsilon)\|\rho^{1/2}u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{5.47}$$

Next, Cauchy inequality and the mass conservation equation $(1.1)_1$ lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_4| &\le C\int(|\rho_t||u|+\rho|u_t|)(|\nabla u_t||u_{tt}|+|u_t||\nabla u_{tt}|)dx\\
&\le C\int(|\nabla\rho||u|^2+\rho|u||\nabla u|+\rho|u_t|)(|\nabla u_t||u_{tt}|+|u_t||\nabla u_{tt}|)dx\\
&\le C(\varepsilon)\int|\nabla\rho|^2|u|^4\bar{x}^{1+a}\varphi^2dx+C(\varepsilon)\int(\rho|u||\nabla u|)^2\bar{x}^{1+a}\varphi^2dx\\
&\quad+C(\varepsilon)\int\rho^2|u_t|^2\bar{x}^{1+a}\varphi^2dx+\varepsilon\int(|u_{tt}|^2\bar{x}^{-2}+|\nabla u_{tt}|^2)dx\triangleq\sum_{i=1}^{4}J_4^i,
\end{aligned}\tag{5.48}$$

where

$$\varphi\triangleq\bar{x}^{-(a-1)/2}|\nabla u_t|+|u_t|\bar{x}^{-(1+a)/2}$$

satisfies that for any $p\ge2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\varphi\|_{L^p}&\le C(p)\left(\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}+\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^p}+\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^p}+1\right)\\
&\le C(p)\left(\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{H^1}+\|\nabla^3u\|_{L^q}+1\right)
\end{aligned}\tag{5.49}$$

due to (5.35) and (5.36).

It follows from (4.22), (5.29), and (5.49) that

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_4^1|&\le C(\varepsilon)\|\bar{x}^a\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}^2\||u|^4\bar{x}^{1-a}\|_{L^\infty}\|\varphi\|_{L^{2q/(q-2)}}^2\\
&\le C(\varepsilon)\left(\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{H^1}^2+\|\nabla^3u\|_{L^q}^2+1\right),
\end{aligned}\tag{5.50}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_4^2|&\le C(\varepsilon)\int|u|^2|\nabla u|^2\bar{x}^{1-a}\varphi^2dx\\
&\le C(\varepsilon)\||u|^2\bar{x}^{1-a}\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^2\|\varphi\|_{L^4}^2\\
&\le C(\varepsilon)\left(\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{H^1}^2+\|\nabla^3u\|_{L^q}^2+1\right).
\end{aligned}\tag{5.51}$$

Similarly, (4.22), (5.35) and (5.49) lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_4^3|&\le C(\varepsilon)\int|u_t|^2\bar{x}^{1-a}\varphi^2dx\\
&\le C(\varepsilon)\|u_t\bar{x}^{(1-a)/2}\|_{L^{8/(a-1)}}^2\|\varphi\|_{L^{8/(5-a)}}^2\\
&\le C(\varepsilon)(1+\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2)\left(\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{H^1}^2+\|\nabla^3u\|_{L^q}^2+1\right).
\end{aligned}\tag{5.52}$$

One deduces from (3.4), (3.5), and (2.6) that

$$J_4^4\le C\varepsilon\int\rho|u_{tt}|^2dx+C\varepsilon\int|\nabla u_{tt}|^2dx.\tag{5.53}$$

Substituting (5.50)-(5.53) into (5.48) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_4\le&C(\varepsilon)(1+\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2)\left(\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{H^1}^2+\|\nabla^3u\|_{L^q}^2+1\right)\\
&+C\varepsilon\int\rho|u_{tt}|^2dx+C\varepsilon\int|\nabla u_{tt}|^2dx.
\end{aligned}\tag{5.54}$$

Next, direct calculations show

$$\begin{aligned}|J_5| &\le C\int(|\rho_t||u|+\rho|u_t|)(|\nabla u|^2|u_{tt}|+|u||\nabla^2u||u_{tt}|+|u||\nabla u||\nabla u_{tt}|)dx\\ &\le C(\varepsilon)\int|\nabla\rho|^2|u|^4\bar{x}^{1+a}\varphi_1^2dx+C(\varepsilon)\int(\rho|u||\nabla u|+\rho|u_t|)^2\bar{x}^{1+a}\varphi_1^2dx\\ &\quad+\varepsilon\int(|u_{tt}|^2\bar{x}^{-2}+|\nabla u_{tt}|^2)dx\triangleq\sum_{i=1}^2J_5^i+\varepsilon\int(|u_{tt}|^2\bar{x}^{-2}+|\nabla u_{tt}|^2)dx,\end{aligned}\tag{5.55}$$

where

$$\varphi_1\triangleq|\nabla u|^4+\bar{x}^{1-a}|u|^2(|\nabla^2u|^2+|\nabla u|^2)$$

satisfies that for any $p\ge 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\varphi_1\|_{L^p}&\le C\|\nabla u\|_{L^{4p}}^4+C\||u|\bar{x}^{(1-a)/2}\|_{L^\infty}^2(\|\nabla^2u\|_{L^{2p}}^2+\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2p}}^2)\\ &\le C(p)+C(p)\|\nabla^3u\|_{L^q}^2,\end{aligned}\tag{5.56}$$

due to (5.29) and (5.3).

It follows from (4.22), (5.29), (5.56), and (5.35) that

$$\begin{aligned}|J_5^1|\le&C(\varepsilon)\|\bar{x}^a\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}^2\||u|^4\bar{x}^{1-a}\|_{L^\infty}\|\varphi_1\|_{L^{2q/(q-2)}}^2\\ \le&C(\varepsilon)+C(\varepsilon)\|\nabla^3u\|_{L^q}^2,\end{aligned}\tag{5.57}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}|J_5^2|&\le C(\varepsilon)\int(|u|^2|\nabla u|^2+|u_t|^2)\bar{x}^{1-a}\varphi_1^2dx\\ &\le C(\varepsilon)\||u|^2\bar{x}^{1-a}\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}^2\|\varphi_1\|_{L^4}^2\\ &\quad+C(\varepsilon)\|u_t\bar{x}^{(1-a)/2}\|_{L^{8/(a-1)}}^2\|\varphi_1\|_{L^{8/(5-a)}}^2\\ &\le C(\varepsilon)(1+\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2)\left(\|\nabla^3u\|_{L^q}^2+1\right).\end{aligned}\tag{5.58}$$

Putting (5.57), (5.58), and (5.53) into (5.55) gives

$$\begin{aligned}|J_5|\le&C(\varepsilon)(1+\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2)\left(\|\nabla^3u\|_{L^q}^2+1\right)+C\varepsilon\int\rho|u_{tt}|^2dx\\ &+C\varepsilon\int|\nabla u_{tt}|^2dx.\end{aligned}\tag{5.59}$$

Next, Cauchy inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned}|J_6|&\le C\int(|u||\nabla\rho|+\rho|\nabla u|)|u_t||\nabla u||u_{tt}|dx\\ &\le C(\varepsilon)\int\bar{x}^2|u|^2|\nabla\rho|^2|u_t|^2|\nabla u|^2dx+C(\varepsilon)\int\bar{x}^2\rho^2|\nabla u|^4|u_t|^2dx\\ &\quad+\varepsilon\int\bar{x}^{-2}|u_{tt}|^2dx\triangleq\sum_{i=1}^2J_6^i+\varepsilon\int\bar{x}^{-2}|u_{tt}|^2dx.\end{aligned}\tag{5.60}$$

For $r_1=8q/((a-1)(q-2))$ and $r_2=8q/((5-a)(q-2))$, we obtain from (5.35), (4.22), and (5.29) that

$$\begin{aligned}|J_6^1|&\le C(\varepsilon)\|\bar{x}^a\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}^2\||u|^2\bar{x}^{1-a}\|_{L^\infty}\|u_t\bar{x}^{(1-a)/2}\|_{L^{r_1}}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^{r_2}}^2\\ &\le C(\varepsilon)+C(\varepsilon)\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2,\end{aligned}\tag{5.61}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}|J_6^2| &\le C(\varepsilon)\|\bar{x}^a\rho\|_{L^\infty}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^{4r_1/(r_1-2)}}^4\|u_t\bar{x}^{(1-a)/2}\|_{L^{r_1}}^2\\ &\le C(\varepsilon)+C(\varepsilon)\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{5.62}$$

Putting (5.61) and (5.62) into (5.60) shows

$$|J_6| \le C(\varepsilon)+C(\varepsilon)\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2+C\varepsilon\int\rho|u_{tt}|^2dx+C\varepsilon\int|\nabla u_{tt}|^2dx.\tag{5.63}$$

Next, similar to (5.45), we have

$$\|P_{tt}\|_{L^2}\le C(1+\|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,q}}+\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}),$$

which together with direct calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned}|J_7|+|J_8| &\le C\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\int\rho|u_{tt}|^2dx+\varepsilon\int|\nabla u_{tt}|^2dx+C(\varepsilon)\|P_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2\\ &\le C\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\int\rho|u_{tt}|^2dx+\varepsilon\int|\nabla u_{tt}|^2dx\\ &\quad+C(\varepsilon)(1+\|\nabla u\|_{W^{1,q}}^2+\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2).\end{aligned}\tag{5.64}$$

Finally, it follows from (4.22), (5.35), and (5.36) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int\rho|\dot{u}_t+u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}-u_{tt}|^2dx\\ &=\int\rho|(u\cdot\nabla u)_t+u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}|^2dx\\ &\le C\int\bar{x}^{-a}\left(|u_t|^2|\nabla u|^2+|u|^2|\nabla u_t|^2+|u|^2|\nabla\dot{u}|^2\right)dx\\ &\le C\|\bar{x}^{-a/2}u_t\|_{L^{8/a}}^2\|\nabla u\|_{L^{8/(4-a)}}^2+C\|\bar{x}^{-a/4}u\|_{L^\infty}^2\|\bar{x}^{-a/4}\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2\\ &\quad+C\|\bar{x}^{-a/2}u\|_{L^\infty}^2\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2\\ &\le C+C\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2,\end{aligned}$$

which together with (5.1) implies

$$C^{-1}t\int\rho|u_{tt}|^2dx-C\le t\int\rho|\dot{u}_t+u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}|^2dx\le Ct\int\rho|u_{tt}|^2dx+C.\tag{5.65}$$

Substituting (5.37), (5.46), (5.47), (5.54), (5.59), (5.63), and (5.64) into (5.34), choosing ε suitably small, and multiplying the resulting inequality by t^2, we obtain after using Gronwall's inequality, (5.1), (5.27), and (5.65) that

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}t^2\|\rho^{1/2}u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2+\int_0^T t^2\|\nabla u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2dt\le C,\tag{5.66}$$

which together with (5.65) gives

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}t^2\int\rho|\dot{u}_t+u\cdot\nabla\dot{u}|^2dx\le C.\tag{5.67}$$

The combination of (5.66) with (5.67) finishes the proof of Lemma 5.3.

Proposition 5.4 *It holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{0\le t\le T}\left(\|\nabla u\|_{H^1}+t\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q}+t\|\nabla^2 u_t\|_{L^2}+t\|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\right)\\&+\sup_{0\le t\le T}t\|\nabla^2(\rho u)\|_{L^{(q+2)/2}}+\int_0^T\left(\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2+t^2\|\nabla u_{tt}\|_{L^2}^2\right)dt\le C.\end{aligned}\tag{5.68}$$

Proof. First, one deduces from (5.16), (5.67), and (5.1) that

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}t\|\nabla^2\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\le C,\tag{5.69}$$

which together with (5.23), (5.17), and (5.1) leads to

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}t\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q}\le C.\tag{5.70}$$

Next, standard L^2-estimate of elliptic system yields

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla^2 u_t\|_{L^2}\le&C\|\nabla\nabla^\perp\cdot u_t\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla\mathrm{div}u_t\|_{L^2}\\\le&C\|\nabla\nabla^\perp\cdot u_t\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla((2\mu+\lambda)\mathrm{div}u_t)\|_{L^2}\\&+C\|\rho^{\beta-1}\mathrm{div}u_t\|_{L^{2q/(q-2)}}\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}\\\le&C\|\rho u_{tt}\|_{L^2}+C\|\rho u\cdot\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla(\lambda_t\mathrm{div}u)\|_{L^2}+C\|\rho_t\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\\&+C\|\rho u_t\cdot\nabla u\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla P_t\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{H^1}+C\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q}+C,\end{aligned}\tag{5.71}$$

where in the third inequality we have used (5.33) and (5.36).

We estimate each term on the right-hand side of (5.71) as follows:

First, it follows from (4.22), (5.29), (5.36), and (5.1) that

$$\begin{aligned}t\|\rho u\cdot\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}&\le Ct\|u\bar{x}^{-a/2}\|_{L^\infty}\|\bar{x}^{-a/2}\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}\\&\le C+Ct\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}\le C,\end{aligned}\tag{5.72}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}t\|\nabla(\lambda_t\mathrm{div}u)\|_{L^2}&\le Ct\|\nabla\lambda_t\|_{L^2}\|\mathrm{div}u\|_{L^\infty}+Ct\|\lambda_t\|_{L^2}\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^\infty}\\&\le C\|\lambda_t\|_{H^1}\left(1+t\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q}\right)\\&\le C,\end{aligned}\tag{5.73}$$

where in the third inequality we have used (5.41), (5.42), and (5.70).

Next, one deduces from (5.29), (4.22), and (5.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}t\|\rho_t\dot{u}\|_{L^2}&\le Ct\||u||\nabla\rho||\dot{u}|\|_{L^2}+Ct\|\rho|\mathrm{div}u||\dot{u}|\|_{L^2}\\&\le Ct\|\bar{x}^{1-a}u\|_{L^\infty}\|\bar{x}^a\nabla\rho\|_{L^q}\|\bar{x}^{-1}\dot{u}\|_{L^{2q/(q-2)}}+Ct\|\mathrm{div}u\|_{L^\infty}\\&\le Ct\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}+Ct\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q}+C.\end{aligned}\tag{5.74}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (5.20) and (5.1).

Finaly, similar to (5.41), we have

$$\|\nabla P_t\|_{L^2}\le C.\tag{5.75}$$

Putting (5.72)-(5.75) into (5.71) together with (5.70), (5.69), and (5.66) gives that

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} t\|\nabla^2 u_t\|_{L^2} \le C. \tag{5.76}$$

Next, it follows from (5.29), (4.22), (5.31), and (5.1) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& t\|\nabla^2(\rho u)\|_{L^{(q+2)/2}} \\
& \le Ct\||\nabla^2\rho||u|\|_{L^{(q+2)/2}} + Ct\||\nabla\rho||\nabla u|\|_{L^{(q+2)/2}} + Ct\|\rho\nabla^2 u\|_{L^{(q+2)/2}} \\
& \le Ct\|\bar{x}^{\delta_0}\nabla^2\rho\|_{L^2}^{2/(q+2)}\|\nabla^2\rho\|_{L^q}^{q/(q+2)}\|\bar{x}^{-2\delta_0/(q+2)}u\|_{L^\infty} \\
& \quad + Ct\|\nabla\rho\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla u\|_{L^q} + C + Ct\|\rho\|_{L^{q(q+2)/(q-2)}}\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^q} \\
& \le C.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.77}$$

Finally, multiplying (5.33) by u_t and integrating the resulting equation over $\mathbb{R}^2$ yield that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int \rho|u_t|^2 dx + \int \left(\mu|\nabla u_t|^2 + (\mu+\lambda)(\mathrm{div} u_t)^2\right) dx \\
& \le C\int |\lambda_t||\mathrm{div} u||\nabla u_t| dx + C\int |\rho u\cdot\nabla(\dot{u}\cdot u_t)| dx \\
& \quad + C\int \rho|u_t|^2|\nabla u| dx + C\int |P_t||\mathrm{div} u_t| dx \\
& \le \frac{\mu}{2}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\lambda_t\|_{L^2}^2\|\mathrm{div} u\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C\int \rho^2|u|^2(|u_t|^2 + |u|^2|\nabla u|^2) dx \\
& \quad + C\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C\int \rho|u_t|^2 dx\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty} + C\|P_t\|_{L^2}^2 \\
& \le \frac{\mu}{2}\|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\nabla u\|_{L^q}^{2(q-1)/q}\|\nabla^3 u\|_{L^q}^{2/q} + C\int \rho|u_t|^2 dx(1 + \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}) \\
& \quad + C\|\nabla\dot{u}\|_{L^2}^2 + C,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (5.42). This combining with Gronwall's inequality, (5.3), and (5.27) yields

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}\int \rho|u_t|^2 dx + \int_0^T \|\nabla u_t\|_{L^2}^2 dt \le C,$$

which together with (5.70), (5.76), (5.77), (5.69), (5.3), and (5.32) yields (5.68) and thus finishes the proof of Proposition 5.4.

6 Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let (ρ_0, u_0) be as in (1.6). For $\rho_0^\delta = \rho_0 + \delta e^{-|x|^2} > 0$, we see that $(\rho_0^\delta, \rho_0^\delta u_0)$ satisfy (1.6). The local existence result, Lemma 2.1, applies to show that the problem (1.1)-(1.4) with initial data $(\rho_0^\delta, \rho_0^\delta u_0)$ has a unique local strong solution (ρ^δ, u^δ), defined up to a positive time T_0 and satisfying (1.8). Propositions 4.2 and 4.3 together with Lemma 2.1 thus yield that (ρ^δ, u^δ) exists on $\mathbb{R}^2\times(0,T]$ for any $T>0$ and satisfies Propositions 4.2 and 4.3 with C independent of δ. Then letting $\delta\to 0$, standard arguments (see [3, 26, 32]) thus show that the problem (1.1)-(1.4) has a global strong solution (ρ, u) satisfying the properties listed in Theorem 1.1 except the uniqueness of

(ρ, u) satisfying (1.8). Since the uniqueness of (ρ, u) satisfying (1.8) is similar to that of [21], we finish the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let (ρ_0, u_0) satisfy (1.6), (1.9), and (1.10). Set $\rho_0^\delta = \rho_0 + \delta e^{-|x|^2} > 0$. Then $(\rho_0^\delta, \rho_0^\delta u_0)$ satisfy (1.6), (1.9), and (1.10). The local existence result, Lemma 2.1, applies to show that the problem (1.1)-(1.4) with initial data $(\rho_0^\delta, \rho_0^\delta u_0)$ has a unique local classical solution (ρ^δ, u^δ), defined up to a positive time T_0 and satisfying (1.8) and (1.11). Propositions 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, and 5.4 together with Lemma 2.1 thus yield that (ρ^δ, u^δ) exists on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, T]$ for any $T > 0$ and satisfies all these estimates presented in Propositions 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, and 5.4 with C independent of δ. Moreover, (5.2) holds with $C(R)$ independent of δ. Then letting $\delta \to 0$, standard arguments thus show that the limit functions (ρ, u) satisfying (1.8) and (1.11) are in fact the classical solution to the problem (1.1)-(1.4) in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \infty)$. We finish the proof of Theorem 1.2.

References

[1] Beale, J. T.; Kato, T.; Majda. A. Remarks on the breakdown of smooth solutions for the 3-D Euler equations. Commun. Math. Phys. **94** (1984), 61-66.

[2] Brézis, H.; Wainger, S. A note on limiting cases of Sobolev embeddings and convolution inequalities. Commun. Partial Differential Equations, **5** (1980), no. 7, 773-789.

[3] Cho, Y.; Choe, H. J.; Kim, H. Unique solvability of the initial boundary value problems for compressible viscous fluids. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **83** (2004), 243-275.

[4] Choe, H. J.; Kim, H. Strong solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations for isentropic compressible fluids. *J. Differ. Eqs.* **190** (2003), 504-523.

[5] Coifman, R.; Rochberg, R.; Weiss, G. Factorization theorems for Hardy spaces in several variables, Ann. of Math. **103** (1976), 611-635.

[6] Coifman, R. R.; Meyer, Y. On commutators of singular integrals and bilinear singular integrals. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **212** (1975), 315-331.

[7] Coifman, R.; Lions, P. L.; Meyer, Y.; Semmes, S. Compensated compactness and Hardy spaces. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **72** (1993), no. 3, 247-286.

[8] Engler, H. An alternative proof of the Brezis-Wainger inequality. Commun. Partial Differential Equations, **14** (1989), 541–544.

[9] Fefferman, C. Characterizations of bounded mean oscillation. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., **77** (1971), 587-588.

[10] Feireisl, E. Dynamics of viscous compressible fluids. Oxford University Press, 2004.

[11] Feireisl, E.; Novotny, A.; Petzeltová, H. On the existence of globally defined weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations. J. Math. Fluid Mech. **3** (2001), no. 4, 358-392.

[12] Hoff, D. Global existence for 1D, compressible, isentropic Navier-Stokes equations with large initial data. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **303** (1987), no. 1, 169-181.

[13] Hoff, D. Global existence of the Navier-Stokes equations for multidimensional compressible flow with discontinuous initial data. J. Diff. Eqs., **120** (1995), 215–254.

[14] Huang, X.; Li, J. Existence and blowup behavior of global strong solutions to the two-dimensional baratropic compressible Navier-Stokes system with vacuum and large initial data. http://arxiv.org/abs/1205.5342

[15] Huang, X.; Li, J.; Xin, Z. P. Serrin Type Criterion for the Three-Dimensional Viscous Compressible Flows. SIAM J. Math. Anal. **43** (2011), no. 4, 1872-1886.

[16] Huang, X.; Li, J.; Xin, Z. P. Global well-posedness of classical solutions with large oscillations and vacuum to the three-dimensional isentropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **65** (2012), 549-585.

[17] Jiu, Q.; Wang, Y.; Xin, Z. P. Global well-posedness of 2D compressible Navier-Stokes equations with large data and vacuum. http://arxiv.org/abs/1202.1382

[18] Kato, T. Remarks on the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations in R^2, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. Vol. 45, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1986, 1-7.

[19] Kazhikhov, A. V.; Shelukhin, V. V. Unique global solution with respect to time of initial-boundary value problems for one-dimensional equations of a viscous gas. *Prikl. Mat. Meh.* **41** (1977), 282-291.

[20] Ladyzenskaja, O. A.; Solonnikov, V. A.; Ural'ceva, N. N. Linear and quasilinear equations of parabolic type, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (1968)

[21] Li, J.; Liang Z. Local well-posedness of strong and classical solutions to Cauchy problem of the two-dimensional barotropic compressible Navier-Stokes equations with vacuum. Preprint.

[22] Lions, P. L. Mathematical topics in fluid mechanics. Vol. **1**. Incompressible models. Oxford University Press, New York, 1996.

[23] Lions, P. L. Mathematical topics in fluid mechanics. Vol. **2**. Compressible models. Oxford University Press, New York, 1998.

[24] Matsumura, A.; Nishida, T. The initial value problem for the equations of motion of viscous and heat-conductive gases. J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **20**(1980), no. 1, 67-104.

[25] Nash, J. Le problème de Cauchy pour les équations différentielles d'un fluide général. Bull. Soc. Math. France. **90** (1962), 487-497.

[26] Perepelitsa, M. On the global existence of weak solutions for the Navier-Stokes equations of compressible fluid flows. SIAM. J. Math. Anal. **38**(2006), no. 1, 1126-1153.

[27] Salvi, R.; Straškraba, I. Global existence for viscous compressible fluids and their behavior as $t \to \infty$. J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **40** (1993), no. 1, 17-51.

[28] Serre, D. Solutions faibles globales des équations de Navier-Stokes pour un fluide compressible. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **303** (1986), 639-642.

[29] Serre, D. Sur l'équation monodimensionnelle d'un fluide visqueux, compressible et conducteur de chaleur. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **303** (1986), 703-706.

[30] Serrin, J. On the uniqueness of compressible fluid motion. *Arch. Rational. Mech. Anal.* **3** (1959), 271-288.

[31] Talenti, G. Best constant in Sobolev inequality. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **110** (1976), 353-372.

[32] Vaigant, V. A.; Kazhikhov. A. V. On existence of global solutions to the two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations for a compressible viscous fluid. Sib. Math. J. **36** (1995), no.6, 1283-1316.

[33] Zhang, T; Fang D. Compressible flows with a density-dependent viscosity coefficient. SIAM J. Math. Analysis, **41** (2009), no.6, 2453-2488.